1997

An Investigation of Home-School Interactions and Interventions: A Family Systems Perspective

Julie A. Lackaff
Loyola University Chicago

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

AN INVESTIGATION OF HOME-SCHOOL INTERACTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS: A FAMILY SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

JULIE A. LACKAFF

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 1997

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people whose support and encouragement helped this dissertation to evolve. First and foremost, I wish to thank my parents who were always there to listen to me when I became frustrated or discouraged. Next, I give my sincerest appreciation and gratitude to the staff, students, and parents of the schools who participated in this study and offered valuable information. A word of thanks to Jim Dawson, a co-worker at my school, and his friend Fred Klaus, a computer genius who salvaged my dissertion at the brink of its completion. Lastly, I wish to thank Dr. Edward Quinnan, the director of my dissertation committee whose continued support, wise advice, and valuable insights helped to turn a vague research interest into a clear and conceptualized study. Much appreciation to Drs. Ronald Morgan and Carol Harding, members of my dissertation committee, whose careful editing of this paper helped to make it more polished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Rationale for Home-School Collaboration

Rich (1987) stated: "Families and teachers might wish that the school could do the job alone. But today's school needs families, and today's families need the school. In many ways, this mutual need may be the greatest hope for change." (p. 62). This quote suggests the need for a home-school collaborative approach to problem solving with a child in the school. Although the benefits for all key stakeholders (students, teachers, parents, and schools) have been carefully described by many in the research literature, student outcomes are the primary reason for parents and educators to form a partnership. There is a strong empirical basis to support home-school collaboration to enhance student learning and optimal outcomes for students (Christenson, Rounds, and Franklin, 1992). A review of the literature supports the correlation between parent involvement and the following student outcomes: improvement in grades; test scores; attitudes; self-concept; and behavior; increased completion of assigned homework; higher rates of academic engagement and attendance; and a reduction in suspension rates (Henderson, 1989). Sloane (1991) sums up the research in the area by stating: "It is now well

accepted that the home plays an important role in children's learning and achievement. Some children learn values, attitudes, skills, and behaviors in the home that prepare them well for the tasks of school." (p. 145).

Family-School Intervention: A Family Systems Perspective

In order for a home-school collaborative model to work, school professionals need to first understand how the school and family systems work. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological framework appears to be particularly useful with respect to furthering our understanding of systemic functioning and subsequently the effects different systems have on the child. He examined four types of systems in which a person is a part (microsystem, mesosystem, mesosystem and chronosystem). The term microsystem refers to the relationships among persons and environments in an immediate setting such as the classroom, home, or playground. As Christenson, et al. (1992) points out, home and school are two mircosystems that are used to autonomously operating. As a result, when a child is having a problem at school, it is easier for one microsystem to blame the other for the child's behavior. Plus, one does not need to live with the consequences of the recommendations made for the other microsystem. Bronfenbrenner (1979), dealt with this issue when he described the next system which is the mesosytem. The term mesosystem refers to the interrelationships among the various microsystems of which the child is a part. It

is well established that children may behave differently in different settings. Not only may home and school behavior vary, but a child's behavior may vary from classroom to classroom. The attempts to find out why a child seems to get along and function better in one environment over another is a practical example of an ecological inquiry. Bronfenbrenner (1979) claimed that there are larger systems to which an individual belongs. These systems are the exosystems which includes the social structures and institutions of a society, and the chronosystems which includes the individual's development of changes over time in the environment in which he or she is living. It should be noted that it is at the micro- and mesosystemic levels, where school psychologists, counselors, and social workers can achieve some leverage for producing change.

A Qualitative Pilot Study

Quinnan, Lackaff, Massoth, and Mechanick (1994) examined the mesosystemic relationship between schools and families in a qualitative research study. Their research and findings became a pilot for the current study. Graduate student researchers made use of naturalistic participant observations in the first grade classrooms and main offices of two elementary schools (one public and one private) on the North side of Chicago. In keeping with a Grounded Theory mehtodology, the observers entered the setting with only one directive: What do school personnel communicate to

families? The following summarizes the categories identified through observation, and the recognition of distinct cultures which operate in the two schools, one a public institution and the other a private. The recognition of distinct school cultures raises implications for the clinician who hopes to provide services for families affected by these systems.

The first theme that emerged from this qualitative study was categorized as school environment. The public school staff appeared to interact with families and students in a hierarchical fashion whereas the private school functioned collaboratively, making use of any one present to fill a roll. Table 1 expresses the differences that were observed.

Table 1

School Environment

Public School	Private School
1. Hierarchical	1. Collaborative
2. Formal Titles	2. First Names
3. Established Teachers	3. New Teachers
4. Faculty in 40s and 50s	4. Faculty in 20s
5. Gate Keeping Obvious	5. Amorphous Boundaries
6. Mentoring of Observers	6. Peer Interactions with Observers

Table 1 (continued)

7. Office Hours for Principal	7. Must catch Principal on the run
8. Secretary blocks office entrance	8. Observers Deputized to answer phones

The second theme that emerged in Quinnan's, et al. (1994) project was the parent-school interactions that were observed. In keeping with the two school cultures, parents had differing positions within the overall structure. In the public system, parents operated at a subsidiary level. In the private system, parents occupied a variety of roles, depending on the need of the moment. Table 2 illustrates the differences.

Table 2

Parent-School Interactions

Public School	Private School
1. Local School Committee (LSC) elected by parents	1. Committee formed to save school
2. Stated that LSC runs the school	2. School and parents espouse collective ownership of school
3. Rules of Parliamentary procedure employed	3. Empowerment of one another

Table 2 (continued)

4. Parents socialized by administrative procedures	4. Parents informally gather into offering service
5. Language difficulties and cultural differences	5. Highly educated parents
6. Formal announcements	6. Telephone network
7. Faculty and administration are older than parents	7. Campaign against central administration

Teachers' expectations of children and families differed in each school and therefore was a third theme that emerged. Table 3 illustrates these differences between the two schools.

Table 3

Teachers' Expectations of Children and Families

Public School	Private School
1. Teachers expect parental support	1. Teachers expect parents to teach
2. Teachers ask parents to spend 15 minutes a night to reinforce lessons.	2. Parents teach and test spelling

Table 3 (continued)

3. Home projects are concrete and large projects are kept to a minimum	3. Home projects are abstract and large projects are done every other week
4. Deficiency Notices given for problems	4. Progress Reports sent home weekly
5. Teachers expect parents have little time for homework	5. Teachers expect that education is a priority for parents
6. Financial downturn for parents	6. Parents pay tuition
7. Teachers emphasize values	7. Teachers assume values orientation

The interactions between the students and teachers were also observed to differ in the two schools. In the public system, the teachers emphasized conformity to the rules of the classroom. The noise level of the overall school and individual classrooms was subdued. In the private system, the teachers emphasized responsibility, allowing students more latitude in their behavior. The noise level of the private classrooms and school was appreciably higher. Table 4 presents examples of these differences.

Table 4

Teacher-Student Interactions

Public School	Private School
1. Concrete expectations	1. Responsibility emphasized
2. Classrooms have a uniform activity where order is emphasized	2. Classrooms are chaotic at times and teachers and principals ignore noise
3. Attention emphasized	3. Latitude given for individual activity
4. Positive reinforcement	4. Positive and negative reinforcement used
5. One verbal warning and time-outs given	5. Three verbal warnings then behavioral intervention

The teaching methodology and philosophy of the two schools were different and the following quotes well summarize the ways the teachers interpret their settings. A teacher from the public school noted: "Our kids need a structured environment, because they don't get it at home. I believe we can save these kids, no matter where they come from, by instilling good solid skills in them now." A private school teacher's quote reinforces the more collaborative and creative setting that the researchers also observed: "We use literature based reading. If I had

basals, I wouldn't use them because I don't think they lead to creative learning." Table 5 further exemplifies these two philosophies.

Table 5

Teaching Methodology

Public School	Private School
1. Content and methods are concern of an oversight committee	1. Individual teachers are responsible for content and method
2. Curriculum approved by Curriculum Review Board	2. Principal offers suggestions and teachers develop own curriculum
3. Basal, Whole Language and Phonetics Reading Texts	3. No texts, literature used
4. Teachers retain what they like, but add what is required by the district	4. Teachers devise own reading material
5. Periodic testing, students receive certificates for progress	5. Periodic testing, with parents involved in all phases of students' progress

Quinnan, et al. (1994) further explained that when doing therapy with school age children, the systems in which the child operates (the family and school) must be

addressed. Systems theory well addresses the familial influence on the child, but has only begun to extend itself to examine the school systems in which the child plays a role. Quinnan, et al. (1994) addressed this in their study. Example A below taken from Epstein and Dauber (1991) provides a case example of the possible interaction between systems:

Example A
Linda had brought her daughter Amy to therapy on the advice of Amy's third grade teacher Ms. Wells. Ms. Wells has found Amy difficult to handle in class and reported steadily decreasing academic performance. Linda believed her divorce contributed to the school problem. In a joint session with teacher, mother, and daughter, Amy revealed her fear of the teacher. Ms. Wells' interaction had much in common with those of Amy's father. Amy's father, however, enforced his structure with periodic eruptions of violence. A contract between teacher and student removed Amy's fear of consequences and helped her to grow comfortable in the third grade classroom. Therapy concluded after 10 sessions. (p. 290).

The resonance established between the two powerful but highly structured systems paralyzed the child. The intervention which provided the child with an ability to influence the structure, and to understand the gradation of consequences, helped her to accomodate to both settings. The importance of understanding the family and school systems in which a child operates had been established. The next section hopes to further our understanding of family and school systemic functioning and the impact the two systems have on a child.

Family-School Intervention: A Family Systems Perspective

Carlson (1992) provided a method for furthering our

understanding the systemic functioning of schools and families based on structural family therapy. Carlson delineated a model of assessing a child with a school-related problem using an ecosystemic home-school collaborative model. Although based on family systems, schools and families share several fundamental organizational similarities that enhance the applicability of this model to schools. Schools and families are structurally and functionally similar. Both the family and school systems exist primarily to socialize children and include such functions as nurturance, education, safety, food and shelter. Both systems are believed to be structurally open, which means that each survive by maintaining a delicate equilibrium or continuity while faced with continuous demands for adjustment from outside boundaries (Conoley, 1987).

Structurally, schools and families are also hierarchically organized, often with males in positions of authority, and with the effects of stress at higher levels of the hierarchy felt at lower hierarchical levels. Like families, schools are comprised of various overt and covert subsystems. Rigid covert alliances in schools, as in families, can create organizational distress (Fisher, 1986). Finally, both family and school systems possess a well-articulated belief or value system, which influences the nature of their interacting transactions.

The basic premises of the systemic model are that: (1) systems are organized, and (2) they operate through transactional patterns. Transactional patterns refer to invisible rules and operational routines that define how the interdependent, subordinate parts relate to each other and how they influence the larger system. The term structure refers to the relatively enduring transactional patterns that organize the components of the system into a somewhat stable relationship. Systems are organized hierarchically, with the various subsystems reflecting differentiated roles within the systems. For example, the organizational pattern in the schools would place the principal on the top of the hierarchy. The degree to which the power is shared with other roles (i.e., vice-principal, counselor) is likely to reflect the other systemic roles played by the individual holding the principal's job.

There is no correct hierarchical structure based on this structural model. The factors that are critical to successful system operation include: (1) clarity and agreement among members regarding the desired hierarchy, (2) adequate power or force of members to carry out operations within their designated hierarchical position, and (3) a match between hierarchical position and assigned purpose within the system. The absence of these criteria are illustrated in the following dysfunctional family patterns: (1) parents have widely discrepant rules for their children

and fail to agree on who is in charge, (2) a parent is assumed to be hierarchically in charge of the family but lacks the power to behave authoritatively, and (3) a child has the force to dominate the family (or classroom) but this capacity does not match the child's purpose (i.e., to be socialized by adults) within the system. An initial focus of assessment, therefore, is the power hierarchy within the family and/or school systems. According to Haley (1987), child problems most frequently derive from confused hierarchy, which is evident in the patterns of interaction surrounding rule establishment, rule clarity, monitoring, rule enforcement, consistency, and follow-through.

Closeness, distance, and information exchange between members of the family, between school personnel related to the problem child, and between the family and school are the second key targets of assessment. Parameters of closeness and distance can be observed by noting physical contact, amount of verbal communication, communication content, distribution of gaze, personal physical spacing, and emotional space. The closeness and distance between family members is equivalent to an assessment of the boundaries of the system from a structural perspective. Critical to adequate system functioning is a structure that permits the accomplishment of the differentiated roles of the subsystems (i.e., autonomy), yet provides the necessary information, resources, and emotional support (i.e., cohesion) to

accomplish functions.

Although there can be many workable system structures that exist, the adequacy of a system's organization is strongly related to the clarity of boundaries or rules regarding participation in different roles (Haley, 1987). Boundaries serve to protect the differentiation of the family system such that autonomy and cohesion can be reciprocally operative. Systems or relationships within and between systems that have overly intrusive boundaries, with low levels of differentiation between subsystems, are labeled enmeshed, whereas overly rigid boundaries that promote excessive autonomy between systems or subsystems are termed disengaged. Child problems associated with enmeshed systems typically involve a compromise to the development of competence, independence, mastery, and control impulses. Disengaged systems are associated with child problems involving limited monitoring or nurturance, such as conduct disorders (Hoffman, 1981).

A third focus of assessment, which combines the elements of power and boundary, is the identification of pathological triangles within and across systems. Haley (1987) notes that most child problems involve both a malfunctioning hierarchy and a pathological triangle. Bowen (1978) is credited with first observing dysfunctional triangular arrangements in families. He observed that triangles emerge when the tension is intolerable between two

members of a system, and a third member (often the symptomatic child) is brought in to diffuse it.

A fourth target of systemic assessment is the discrete, time-limited sequences of behavior that constitute a particular transaction, especially transactions that surround the identified problem of the child in the family and school settings. The goal of the assessment is to identify the feedback loops that are operating in a homeostatic manner to maintain the child's problem. Feedbach loops refer to the communication pathways across boundaries within the system that signal to members their degree of conformity or discrepancy from the overall purpose of the system. Feedback loops that promote stability, equilibrium, and a reduction of behavior inconsistent with system goals are termed constancy or deviation-countering loops. Feedback loops that promote growth, diversity, change, or an increase in activity are termed variety or deviation-amplifying loops. Both types of feedback are essential to functional systems. Over-reliance on one type of feedback loop may exaceberate a child difficulty and point to the need for an intervention that disrupts the ineffective feedback loop and replaces it with an alternative action (Hoffman, 1981).

The perceptions or beliefs that system members have developed regarding their role and function and the meaning of the child's problem behavior is the final target of

assessment in the systemic-structural model. Although the systemic-structural model has not articulated the interface of cognition and behavior as well as the cognitive-behavioral model, challenging the perceptions of reality that system members hold is noted as an important class of interventions that facilitate changing the interactions underlying the symptom (Minuchin, 1974). Perceptions and beliefs regarding the child's problem can be determined by listening to the descriptions of the problem as provided by system members.

In summary, the systemic-structural model can be used to assess the family system, the school system, and/or the family-school relationships. An assessment from this perspective is typically based on a set of systematic observations of the interactions within or between the family and school system. Interviews and scales can also be used. Quinnan, et al. (1994) used observations and interviews in their qualitative study to examine family and school systemic functioning. The present study extends Quinnan's, et al (1994) study, but seeks to examine systemic functioning in a quantitative manner utilizing scales and questionnaires. One scale that follows Carlson's (1992) method of understanding family functioning based on structural family therapy is the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale or FACES. The scale is based on Olson's Circumplex Model (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Muxen, Larsen,

and Wilson, 1989). After studying the variables used by a number of systems theorists, he isolated three major variables (cohesion, adaptability and communication).

Cohesion is measured on a continuum from disengaged to enmeshed. The midpoint of this continuum is described as ranging from separated to connected. On the adaptability continuum, families are rated as chaotic, flexible, structured, or rigid. Cohesion and adaptability are curvilinear variables and can be easily mapped on a circle. For example, a family characterized by erratic discipline, lacking parental leadership, and evidencing little closeness would be rated as chaotically disengaged. The third variable, communication, is also a linear variable running from low to high. Communication is evaluated in terms of listening skills, speaker's skills, self-disclosure, clarity, continuity, and respect.

Olson devised the Family Adaptability Cohesion Evaluation Scale-II (FACES-II) based on his Circumplex Model to measure these constructs (Olson, et al., 1989). This scale is to be completed by family members in terms of their perceptions of their family. Olson also devised a scale called the Clinical Rating Scale (CRS) which is completed by a therapist in terms of his or her perceptions of the family. Lusterman (1985) adapted the CRS to evaluate the school team which is organized around the dysfunctional child. It was used to evaluate the team's internal

structure and communication, as well as its communication with the family. Once the family and school systems have been described, a good first picture of how the ecosystem is currently operating can be obtained, and changes in their interaction and internal organization can be clearly followed.

Following Carlson's (1992) theory that families and schools function similarily based on structural family therapy, I wanted to examine the functioning using a scale that assesses both the school and family. The FACES-II measures family systemic functioning, however, there is no comparable scale that measures school functioning. As a result, in this research study an adaptation of Olson's, et al. (1989) FACES-II instrument to the school system (called the School FACES-II) was used to investigate the ways families perceive their child's school and/or classroom. Cohesion and adaptability are two dimensions measured on the School FACES-II (as with the FACES-II). Questions on this scale include the following: (1) School members and parents discuss problems together and feel good about solutions; (2) Discipline is fair in our school; and (3) Children have a say in their discipline at their school. These questions are designed to assess how cohesive and adaptive the school is in terms of its relationship to families and school members as well as the rules and regulations of the school.

By comparing how the school and family functions,

clinicians working with families can compare the families' scores on the FACES-II instrument and their scores on the School FACES-II instrument to determine the differences in how the families perceive the two environments. By systematically examining these differences and/or similarities, clinicians can help parents see more clearly why their child may function differently in the two environments. Another use of the School FACES-II instrument is to help assess systemic difficulties that may occur amongst school personnel. Overall, it was hypothesized that when a child is in two healthy and balanced environments (the school and family system), he or she may be able to learn and function better. In sum, this dissertation research project was designed to increase our understanding of how the FACES-II and School FACES-II instruments can be used to help families and schools.

As an extension of Quinnan's, et al. (1994) study, the present study continues to investigate the differences and/or similarities of the same two schools. It is hoped that an even clearer understanding of the school cultures will manifest by using the School FACES-II. As systems theory holds, that as all human systems are interactive, one system cannot influence another without it somehow being changed in turn. In keeping with this theory, it was hypothesized that parents' scores on the FACES-II might correlate with their scores on the School FACES-II. In

other words, family systemic functioning might influence or change the school systemic functioning and vice versa. The ethnicity, acculturation and educational levels of the families are variables that may influence this functioning as well and will be addressed in this study. Lastly, it was hypothesized that the more healthy and balanced the parents perceive their schools to function the more satisfied they will be with their schools. In sum, the better we understand family and school systemic functioning, the interrelationship between the two, and the variables that influence their functioning, the better able we will be to help a child having difficulties.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale-II

As Bronfenbrenner (1979) stated, the two major microsystems in which a child interacts is the school and family. In order to understand why a child may be having difficulties at home or school, it is therefore important to understand how these two systems function and subsequently affect the child. Examining these systems independently, however, is not enough. Mesosystemic functioning, or the interrelationship between two microsystems, is also an important variable to consider. For example, a child's behavior may vary from setting to setting and it is easy for one system such as the home to blame another system such as the school for a child's problem. How these systems interact to help meet the needs of the child is therefore important.

Quinnan, et al. (1994) discovered in their qualitative investigation of two schools that each school had distinct cultures and methods of functioning. For example, the public school appeared to function in a hierarchical fashion whereas the public school functioned in a more collaborative manner. The present study extends Quinnan's, et al. project

and seeks to examine the same schools and their methods of functioning. Rather than continuing to observe these two schools, the present study asks parents to complete scales and questionnaires asking them how they perceive their school to function. One research question asks whether ethnicity and the educational and acculturation levels of the parents affect family systemic functioning which may subsequently affect school systemic functioning. In other words, it is hypothesized that since all systems are interactive, one system cannot influence another without it somehow being changed in turn. The following chapter investigates the literature on scales that assess family functioning and the variables that influence it. In addition, school culture and functioning will be examined and the factors that influence school satisfaction.

The FACES-II is one measure that assesses family cohesion and adaptability and how balanced and healthy the family system functions. The School FACES-II, a scale which was adapted for this study from the FACES-II to measure school systemic functioning, hopes to measure similar constructs. It is hoped that both can be useful in determining how the functioning of each system affects the functioning of the child.

As noted in Chapter One, the FACES-II instrument emerged from Olson's Circumplex Model. Originally, Olson (Olson, et al., 1989) described families as falling into one

of four levels of cohesion and one of four levels of adaptability which resulted in sixteen cells and/or types of families. Once couples or families have been categorized into one of sixteen types, it becomes possible to reduce the sixteen types to three more global types (Balanced, Mid-range, and Extreme). Balanced families are those that fall into the two central cells of both cohesion and adaptability. Mid-range families are those that fall into one of the extreme cells on one dimension and a central cell on the other dimension. Extreme families are those that fall into an extreme cell on both dimensions.

Family cohesion is defined by the authors as the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another. Within Olson's model, some of the specific concepts or variables that can be used to diagnose and measure the family cohesion dimensions are: emotional bonding; boundaries; coalitions; time; space; friends; decision making; interests and recreation. There are four levels of cohesion ranging from disengaged (very low), to separated (low to moderate), to connected (moderate to high), to enmeshed (very high). It is hypothesized that the central levels of cohesion (separated and connected) are most viable for positive family functioning. The extremes (disengaged or enmeshed) are generally seen as being problematic. Many families who come for treatment often fall into one of these extremes. When cohesion levels are

high (enmeshed systems), there is overidentification so that loyalty to and concensus within the family prevent individuation of family members. At the other extremes (disengaged systems), high levels of autonomy are encouraged and family members "do their own thing," with limited attachment or committment to their family. It is the central area (separated and connected) of the model where individuals are able to experience and balance being independent from and connected to their family.

Adaptability is defined as the ability of a marital or family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress. In order to describe, measure, and diagnose couples on this dimension, a variety of concepts have been taken from several social science disciplines, with heavy reliance on family sociology. These concepts include: family power (assertiveness, control, discipline); negotiation styles; role relationships and relationship rules. The four levels of adaptability range from rigid (very low), to structured (low to moderate), to flexible (moderate to high), to chaotic (very high). As with cohesion, it is hypothesized that central levels of adaptability (structured and flexible) are more conducive to positive marital and family functioning, while the extremes (rigid and chaotic) are considered to be the most problematic for families as they move through the family

life cycle.

Basically, adaptability focuses on the ability of the marital and family system to change. Much of the early application of systems theory to families emphasized the rigidity of the family and its tendency to maintain the status quo (Haley, 1959, 1962, 1963). "Morphostasis" was the term used to describe the pattern of rigidity to change, and "morphogenesis" was the potential to develop and grow as a system. Until the work of such theorists as Speer (1970) and Wertheim (1973, 1975), the importance of the potential for change received minimal attention. These authors helped to clarify the fact that systems need both stability and change and that it is the ability to change when appropriate that distinguishes functional couples and families from dysfunctional couples and families.

A number of researchers have recently discovered that the FACES-II instrument does not capture the extremely high categories of "enmeshed" and "chaotic" families. Therefore, high scores on the adaptability and cohesion dimensions are reinterpreted as "very connected" and "very flexible." In addition, the higher the scores on both dimensions (i.e., families who score within the "very connected" and "very flexible" ranges), the healthier and more balanced the family is said to be functioning. The lower the scores, the less healthy and more extreme the families supposedly would function. Therefore, instead of examining families in the

circumplex fashion, families are examined in a linear manner.

Research on the FACES-II

Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Muxen, Larsen, and Wilson (1989) conducted a comprehensive study using the FACES-II. They examined normative family processes across the family life cycle. The study was based on a national survey of 1140 married couples and families from 31 states. These couples and families were obtained from a stratefied, randomly selected sample from seven stages of the family life cycle. To obtain this developmental perspective, data were obtained from couples who were newly married through those in their retirement years. Because of the design and focus of the study, the sample consisted entirely of intact marriages and families. The families were predominantly white, middle-income couples in their first marriages. While almost half (45 percent) lived in a community of 25,000 or more, about one-quarter (26 percent) lived on farms or in rural areas. They had an average of three children.

Both husbands and wives were asked to complete various questionnaires, including the FACES-II. In those families in the Adolescent stage, one adolescent from each family was asked to participate. The use of different family members allowed for a more comprehensive perspective on family functioning, and the scores were combined into a single

score that was empirically evaluated. Interestingly, the researchers found that there was a lack of agreement among family members, and there was often a higher relationship among research scales than among family members on the same scale.

The findings from this study strongly suggested that major differences were found across the stages of the family life cycle and among the various members in the family. As a result, the researchers of this study suggested the use of the following four stages in the planning of other research projects or services: couples without children, families with children, families with adolescents, and older couples. Stage and sex differences will be summarized for the five major family dimensions used in this study: family types, family resources, family stress, family coping, and family satisfaction.

In regard to the family types based on the Circumplex Model, few differences were observed across stages or between family members in the percentages of Balanced, Mid-Range, and Extreme types. However, when the dimensions of cohesion and adaptability were considered, significant differences across the stages and among family members on these two dimensions manifested themselves. Overall, wives tended to view their families as more cohesive and adaptable compared to their husbands. Adolescents reported substantially lower levels of both family cohesion and

adaptability than their parents. The general trend between stages indicated that levels of adaptability and cohesion dropped through the first few stages to a low point at the Adolescent stage and then recovered somewhat in the later stages. These findings clearly indicate that there are differing perceptions among family members and differences between stages.

Additional findings were as follows: First, balanced families had greater resources (marital and family strengths) across the family life cycle; Second, because of these resources, balanced families were less vulnerable to stress and dealt more effectively with it; Lastly, balanced families used various coping strategies to deal with stressor events.

Healthy Systems Equal Satisfied Systems

Based on Olson's, et al. (1989) findings, it would seem logical to hypothesize that more balanced and healthy families would also be happier and more satisfied. Indeed, he found that marital and family satisfaction was higher at early and later stages of the family life cycle when couples were living without children. Satisfaction was lowest at the Adolescent stage, when family stress was the highest. There was a strong relationship between marital satsifaction, family satisfaction and overall quality of life. Satisfaction appeared to be higher with higher levels of cohesion and adaptability.

As with families, an effort was made in the present study to determine whether psychologically healthy school functioning (based on scores on the School FACES-II) leads to a greater satisfaction with the schools as rated by parents on a School Satisfaction Questionnaire. Studies examining parents' satisfaction with schools found that satisfaction related more to the quality of relationships among staff, parents, and students than to the quality of resources, teaching methods, class size, and academic results. For example, Hughes, Wikeley, and Nash (1994) found that parents placed much importance on what might be termed the "personal" side of a school, as evidenced by the high placings given to factors such as "relationships," "the staff," and to a lesser extent, the "head teachers."

The category of "relationships," which was the single most frequently mentioned factor, covers a wide range of interactions between the different participants in the life of a school, with particular emphasis on those between teachers, children and parents. Key themes which recurred were the sensitivity with which teachers responded to students and parents and their willingness to listen and explain.

This study also showed the priority which parents gave to the less tangible qualities of a school, such as its "atmosphere" and "ethos," compared with more tangible aspects such as "resources," "facilities," and "small

classes." "Atmosphere" referred to the feeling which a parent or visitor might obtain when walking along the corridors or stepping into a classroom. Interestingly, parents were more concerned with the health and happiness of the school environment over the happiness of their child. In addition, parents felt that although discipline was important, it should be kept within certain limits. The results of this study lead to a number of important implications for where focus should be in education; namely with developing better relationships among school staff, families, and students and developing a school atmosphere that is balanced and healthy.

The School FACES-II developed for this study could help to assess parents' assessment of school and family relationships. As with the assessment of families, communication, cohesion, and adaptability are factors that can be assessed among school members and families. It is hypothesized that the healthier the school is perceived to be functioning by parents and staff, the more satisfied everyone will be. In addition, the healthier the system, the better a child will be able to adjust to the school system.

Home-School Intervention: Factors to Consider

Culture of Families

The health of the school and family system is just the beginning of the ecological assessment procedure. Families

and schools not only differ in psychological and systemic functioning, but they differ in culture, practices and beliefs. In addition, the schools and families may differ as a result of differences in beliefs and cultures. An examination of the practices and beliefs of families from different ethnic groups along with their beliefs about education are therefore warranted.

The Black Family

The first cultural group to be examined is the Black family. It is important to note that Black families are not homogeneous nor do they have a uniform set of experiences. They represent a diverse mixture of ethnic groups and cultures, with the majority being descendants of enslaved Africans from West Africa. The unique background of this group includes the African as well as mainstream or Euro-American cultural heritage, coupled with the experience of slavery and a continuous manifestation of institutional racism, as evidenced in structural unemployment, neighborhood and housing patterns, and numerous forms of subtle human degradation. As a result of this background, Blacks have evolved a set of attitudes, beliefs and behaviors that were necessary to survive in a hostile environment. It is within this functionally adaptive context that researchers are acknowledging the strong, intact, resilient kinships of blacks. Researchers (Gary, Beatty, Berry, and Price, 1983; Royce and Turner, 1980)

described the following proactive devices that they believed black families have used to cope: (1) strong kinship bond; (2) strong work; (3) adaptability of family roles; (4) strong achievement orientation; and (5) strong religious orientation.

In addition to the family being important to blacks, the community in which they reside plays a key role in their lives. First, there is a tendency to informally adopt children and to incorporate nonfamily into the family household (Hill, 1972). Second, there is a pervasive assumption that people are doing the best they can. Overall, community residents care about each other and help each other out. This care and concern is further reflected in the supportive network of black self-help organizations. In short, when the entire community is functioning well and members are fullfilling perspective roles, homeostasis is maintained and all members benefit. In the face of crises, however, adjustments are made that may be detrimental to the entire black family unit.

The history of the blacks in America along with how the family has learned to cope relates to their perception of education. For example, as a result of racism in the work force as well as a less competetive and less individualistic approach to life, education for blacks may or may not be perceived as providing a better life for them. For example, only 56% of the median white income is attained for blacks

in the work force where educational level is the same. As a result, the message seems clear: No matter how hard one works, equity for U.S. blacks remains elusive for many. Although an education is looked at as a hope to a better life for some, the observation of failed attempts at education by many blacks as well as limited monetary gains experienced by those who have been successful in school are constant reminders that school may not lead to a better life. This approach-avoidance conflict existing within the relationship between many black students and the school system and the resulting academic and/or adjustment difficulties (particularly in white school systems) would seem "natural" given the proliferation of contradictory information in daily reality. As with all students, black students' academic failures can occur for many other reasons than those presented above. That said, the purpose of this brief discussion was to provide a context in which to describe the unique experiences of black students within a predominantly white school system (Steward and Logan, 1992).

Based on the above qualities that Black families appear to maintain, it is hypothesized that these families would function very high in cohesion and adaptability on the FACES-II instrument. Black families are very close and demonstrate an adaptability of family roles when necessary. A problem with too much cohesion and adaptability with Black families, however, could result in the lack of development

of competence, independence, and control impulses in children, as well as a confusion of family roles (i.e., child may need to take on parental responsibilities too often).

The Asian-American Family

As with black families, Asian families represent many subcultures that are very different from one another. Many diverse groups are represented within this culture (Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos, Samoans, Hawaiians, as well as persons from India, Pakistan, and Ceylon). Those from the Pacific Islands are also represented within this group. In an attempt to understand Asian-American students and their families, Ho (1976) listed seven salient cultural values operating within their culture: (1) familial piety; (2) shame as a behavioral influence; (3) self-control and self discipline; (4) middle-position virtue; (5) awareness of social milieu; (6) fatalism; and (7) inconspicuousness.

The cultural values listed above are believed to influence the family to function in a certain way. For example, the Asian-American family tends to be cohesive and structured. Male dominance and parental ties are center stage: a male child has distinct obligations and duties to his parents that assume a higher value than obligations to his siblings, children, or wife. Concepts and teachings, such as working hard, responsibility, family obligations, and collaboration, are of utmost importance in parent-child

relationships. The traditional Asian-American family structure provides stability, interpersonal intimacy, social support, and a relatively stress free environment for its members. The traditional hierarchical structure and rigidity of family roles, on the other hand, make the expression and resolution of conflicts very difficult within the nuclear family (Ho, 1992).

Because Asian families appear to be very close as well as rigid at times in terms of family roles and responsibilities, it is hypothesized that these families would score high in cohesion and low on adaptability on the FACES-II of Olson's model of family systemic functioning. When cohesion becomes too high and adaptability becomes too low, however, problems could arise with a child. For example, the high cohesiveness of an Asian family could lead a child to not assert his or her independence and break away from the family when necessary. This overidentification and loyalty with the family could also result in a child not seeking out help when needed until the problem becomes too severe. Rigidity of family roles also could make it difficult for the Asian child to acculturate to different societies and modern societal roles and expectations. For example, an Asian woman may find it difficult to become independent from her family and assert herself in the business world since her role in the family can be rigid and old fashioned.

The Hispanic Family

Hispanic Americans are the nation's fastest growing major subpopulation. The nation's Hispanic population grew by 30 percent between 1980 and 1987, a rate of increase five times that of all other racial and ethnic groups combined accoring to a U.S. Bureau of the Census. Although they are a rapidly growing group (18.8 million in 1987), Hispanics are still reported to be resistent to assimilation and acculturation into the majority culture. As a result, they have tried to maintain much of their cultural heritage and characteristics. These values of the Hispanic culture were described by Ramirez and Castaneda (1974) as falling into four major clusters: (1) identification with family, community, and ethnic group, (2) personalization and interpersonal relationships, (3) status and role definition in family and community, and (4) Mexican Catholic ideology. Included in cluster two are mutual dependence, cooperative behaviors, and a need for affiliation and help. Separation of sex roles and the importance of being well behaved and well educated socially are stressed in cluster three. Authoritarian beliefs based on parents and other adults as representatives of God are included in cluster four. Ramiriz and Castaneda (1974) summarized the value orientation as follows: "Socialization in traditional Hispanic culture results in individuals who are strongly identified with their family and ethnic group, sensitive to

the feelings of others, oriented towards cooperative achievement, respectful of adults and social convention, and they expect to receive close guidance from adults" (p.48).

Researchers have hypothesized that the academic achievement problems of Hispanics are a result of culture or value conflict between home and school/society (Argulewicz and Sanchez, 1982). Hispanic students may be caught between a home culture that advocates compliance with authority, field-sensitive behaviors, and cooperation, and a school culture that values independence. Low achievement may be a manifestation of the conflict.

Hispanic family characteristics such as a strong sense of family and community, cooperation, and dependency are positive qualities which could result in these families scoring high in cohesion and adaptability on the FACES-II scale. Only when cohesion and adaptability levels become too extreme will these families suffer from systemic difficulties. For example, children from these families may not be as assertive and independent in school as well as have to take over family and parental responsibilites and roles too often as a result of overly flexible and adaptable family functioning.

Acculturation

The presentation presented above related to cultural differences in family dynamics and educational perspectives is not highly detailed. It is important that educators do

not stereotype students and their families into any of these categories. In addition, it is important to consider how acculturated the persons in the family are to the majority culture. Acculturation can be defined as the set of circumstances that result when two cultures experience the subsequent alterations in the fundamental sociocultural system of one or both groups. Families may find themselves in a different sociocultural system than the one they left behind. They may feel pressured to conform to different ways of thinking, and feel the need to adjust to a new way of life regarding occupation, financial resources, and social networks. The degree to which an individual acculturates influences his or her attitudes, values, and beliefs. Five stages or levels of acculturation have been proposed by Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1989). It is important that professionals recognize the stage or level of acculturation the family is at so as to better understand how to work with them. For example, it is important to note that a highly acculturated minority individual may have more in common with a member of the dominant cultural group than a member of his or her own group (Flanagan and Miranda, 1995).

Culture and the FACES-II

With regard to cultural differences in family dynamics and functioning, it has been assumed in the past that with modernization, industrialization, and Westernization, the

different patterns will be modified from the traditional form, to resemble the Western family. In other words, a unidirectional change was expected toward the Western model (acculturation). This was also the thesis of Modernization theory. However, some contemporary theorists and researchers have focused on the multidimensional nature of cultural diversity, allowing for a more refined explanation of cultural differences in family dynamics.

Triandis (1990) provided a comprehensive analysis of some important cross-cultural dimensions. His analysis of cultures was useful in determining how families from other cultures would score on the cohesion and adaptability scales on the FACES-II in Florian, Mikulincer, and Weller (1993) study which examined the differences in scores between Arabs and Islamic Jews. First, Triandis' analysis of cultures will be presented. Then, his analysis will be used to help understand more specifically why certain cultures may score differently on the FACES-II. Finally, Triandis' analysis will be used in this study to determine why the subjects who were from different cultures scored the way they did.

Triandis (1990) first explained that cultures are characterized by degree of complexity, which reflects the degree of "diffusion" verses "specificity" of social roles. The more specific a culture the more well defined the social roles an individual may have. In less complex cultures there is a diffusion of roles. In other words, while in

"specific" cultures people relate to each other mainly on the basis of well defined and directly relevant roles, in "diffuse" cultures almost any personal attribute is seen as pertaining to the relationship, irrespective of the social situation. Triandis claims that "while most Western cultures are specific, many middle Eastern cultures are diffuse."

A second important dimension is the degree of collectivist verses individualist cultural orientation. Individualism stresses values of industrial civilization such as personal achievement, competition, and concern with self and self-improvement. Collectivism involves being concerned with others, considering the implications for others of one's decisions, and concern for family security. Collectivists stress hierarchy (i.e., in the family the father is usually the boss and men are superordinate to women). In addition, certain family values (e.g., family integrity, security, obedience, and conformity) are emphasized more by collectivists than by individualists. Although people in every culture have both collectivist and individualist tendencies, the relative emphasis is toward individualism in the West and toward collectivism in the East and South.

A third, related dimension involves cultural homogeneity verses cultural heterogeneity. While people in homogenous cultures may be described as sharing similar

values, norms, beliefs, traditions, etc., in heterogeneous societies diversity and pluralism of values and beliefs prevail. Triandis (1990) claimed that this dimension may be an antecedent of a related cultural dimension: "tightness" verses "looseness." In tight cultures, people are expected to behave according to norms, and there is very little tolerance for deviation. Loose cultures give people a good deal of freedom to deviate from a norm. It should be noted that people in such cultures tend to be more tolerant of behavior that does not conform to normative expectations. Most Arab-Islamic cultures may be characterized as homogeneous-"tight" while most Western-pluralistic societies may be defined as heterogeneous-"loose."

A fourth dimension is related to the importance and centrality of the nuclear family to decision making and family power structure within a given culture. While in some cultures the nuclear family system is predominant, in others the extended family framework is more common and dominant. Nuclear families tend to be found frequently in industrial societies, whereas extended families tend to be found in sedentary, agricultural societies.

The theoretical framework presented above can be used to describe some of the main dimensions that may shape the perception of family dynamics in different cultures, without intending to exclude any other possible dimensions which may also be relevant. Florian, et al. (1993) hypothesized that

differences on these dimensions would be reflected in two basic aspects of family dynamics (family cohesion and family adaptability) described by Olson, et al. (1989). Florian, et al. (1993) hypothesized that in collectivist societies, which emphasize family ties and family integrity, one would expect higher family cohesion than in individualistic societies. In cultures characterized as heterogeneous-"loose" and emphasizing the nuclear family system, flexibility in negotiating with social demands is granted. Thus, in these types of cultures, one may expect higher levels of family adaptability than in heterogenous-"tight" and extended family systems. The findings from Florian, et al.'s (1993) study supported this claim. Israeli Jewish families were found to be individualistic and Western compared to Israeli Arabs who were found to be tight and collectivistic. In other words, Israeli Arabs reported a higher level of family cohesion than Israeli Jews and Israeli Jews perceived higher levels of family adaptability. Although the researchers found significant cultural differences in levels of perceived family cohesion and adaptability, these differences were not evident when families were re-examined by Olson's, et al. (1989) typology (Balanced, Mid-ranged, and Extreme). There may not be, therefore, a cross-cultural difference between Israeli subgroups in proneness to problems in the family.

The study to be described in what follows was designed

to provide a fine grained comparative examination of families across the following ethnic groups: (1) African American, (2) Asian/Pacific Islander, (3) Latino, (4) Euro American, and (5) Other. Based on Triandis' (1990) analysis as well as the results of Florian's, et al. (1993) study, certain hypotheses were gleaned about how families from different cultures might score on the cohesion and adaptability scales on the FACES-II. It was hypothesized that African American, Asian/ Pacific Islander, and Hispanic families would all score higher than Euro Americans on the FACES-II cohesion scale due to their more collectivist (i.e., less individualistic and more family oriented) cultures. On the adaptability scale, on the other hand, it was hypothesized that Euro Americans would score higher than the other cultural groups due to their more "loose" and flexible approach to family roles. In addition, it is hypothesized that African American and Hispanic families will score higher than Asian families on adaptability and all three of these groups would score lower than Euro American families on adaptability.

Other investigators have examined other cultures using the FACES-II and have found different results. Vega, Patterson, Sallis, Nader, Atkins, and Abramson (1986) compared the differences between Mexican-American and Anglo families on the cohesion and adaptability scales on the FACES-II. A sample of 294 parents with school-age children

who were taking part in a community-based health promotion project completed the FACES-II along with an acculturation measure in order to determine if there were differences that might be attributable to intracultural variation among Mexican Americans. No significant differences in mean scores or distributions were detected between ethnic groups for cohesion or adaptability, even when acculturation was controlled. Some differences were found in the distribution of scores into the three regions of the model (balanced, mid-range, and extreme), with Anglos somewhat more likely to be represented in the balanced region and Mexican Americans more likely to be either mid-range or extreme. However, tests for acculturation effects indicated that intracultural variation among Mexican Americans accounts for these differences, with low-acculturation respondents more likely to score outside of the balanced region.

Culture of Schools

The culture of families is not the only factor to consider when working with schools and families. Schools, like families, also function differently cross cultures. For example, Deal (1990) examined the differences between private and public school cultures. He found that private schools functioned by what he called "cultural bonds" or "shared purposes, values, traditions and history" that promote a strong sense of community. Public schools, on the other hand, functioned with "rational bonds" or top-down

"rules, roles, functions, penalties, and formal authority." Quinnan, Lackaff, Massoth, and Mechanick (1994) reported results collected over a two year period that supported these differences between a private school and a public school. For example, the public school appeared to function in a hierarchical manner whereas the private school functioned in a more collaborative fashion. The present study will continue to examine these differences between the schools.

The importance of understanding the functioning of systems, the interrelationship between the systems, and the variables that affect systemic functioning have been established. The study that follows extends Quinnan's et al (1994) qualitative research by examining the same two schools used in their project. Quinnan, et al. found that the two schools had different and distinct ways of functioning. The present study seeks to examine these differences using the School FACES-II. A question to be addressed is whether the School FACES-II will find these same differences. In keeping with systems theory, it is hypothesized that family functioning (as measured by the FACES-II) will influence school functioning and vice versa. In other words, it is hypothesized that the two will correlate. In addition, family and school functioning may be influenced by variables such as the ethnicity and acculturation levels of the parents. Lastly, research has

found that healthy family functioning leads to greater family satisfaction. This study extends this finding and asks whether healthy school functioning will lead to greater parental satisfaction with their children's schools. All of these questions will be addressed in the following study.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

As Bronfenbrenner (1979) stated, the two major systems in which a child interacts is the school and family. In order to understand why a child may be having difficulties at home or school, it is therefore, important to understand how these two systems function independently (microsystemic functioning) and interact (mesosystemic functioning).

Quinnan, et al. (1994) examined the mesosystemic functioning between families and schools in a qualitative, participant observation study. The results from their study led to hypotheses that will be tested in a quantitative manner by examining the same two schools in the present study. The major finding that Quinnan, et al. (1994) found was that the public and private schools they examined on the North side of Chicago functioned differently. More specifically, the public school was observed to function and interact with families in a hierarchical, top-down manner and the private school functioned in a more collaborative and collegial fashion. The main and first hypothesis that emerged from this finding was perhaps the differing ethnic and acculturation and educational levels of the families who attended the two schools influenced not only family systemic

functioning but school systemic functioning as well.

After examining which variables influenced family and school systemic functioning the most (Null Hypothesis One), more specific hypotheses were tested. For example, Null Hypothesis Two tests whether there are significant differences in family and school systemic functioning as a result of the ethnicity of the families. Null Hypothesis Three tests for significant relationships between acculturation levels of the parents and school and family functioning. Extending Carlson's (1992) theory that families and schools function and are structured similarily, Null Hypothesis Four asks whether there is a significant relationship between family and school functioning. After all, as systems theory indicates as all human systems are interactive, one system cannot influence another without it somehow being changed in turn. Quinnan, et al. (1994) found that each school differed systemically and in school culture. Null Hypothesis Five tests for these differences, however, this time asking for the parents' perceptions of their children's schools. Lastly, it is hypothesized that parents who perceive their schools as functioning in an adaptive, flexible and cohesive manner will be more satisfied with the schools. The following are scales and questionnaires that will be used to assess and test these hypotheses: (1) Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale (FACES-II) to assess family systemic functioning, (2) School

FACES-II to assess school systemic functioning, (3) an Acculturation Scale, and (4) a School Satisfaction Questionnaire. See Table 6 for a listing of the Null Hypotheses.

Table 6

Null Hypotheses

HO1--Acculturation scores, cultural groups, educational levels, and School Satisfaction Scores will not have an influence on FACES-II and School FACES-II scores.

HO2--There will be no differences in the FACES-II and the School FACES-II scores across cultural groups.

HO3--There will be no relationship between the FACES-II and the Acculturation scores. There will be no relationship between the School FACES-II and the Acculturation scores.

HO4--There will be no relationship between the FACES-II and the School FACES-II scores.

HO5--There will be no differences in the School FACES-II scores between parents from the public school and parents from the private school.

HO6--There will be no relationship between the School FACES-II and the School Satisfaction Questionnaire scores.

Participants

Initially, two hundred parents whose children attended a private Catholic school in a nearby suburb of Chicago and

200 parents whose children attended a Chicago public school were asked to participate as volunteers in the investigation. Demographic data pertaining to these two schools is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Demographic Data

	Public	Private
School Population	882	289
Average Class Size	27.70	26.20
Students' Ethnic Backgrounds		
Native American	.60%	.00%
Asian	25.60%	37.40%
Black Non-Hispanic	22.40%	3.10%
Hispanic	34.40%	7.90%
White Non-Hispanic	17.00%	50.80%
Other	.00%	.60%
Grades Served	k-8	Pre-k-8

Because the private school had fewer students and 200 participants were needed, almost all parents from the private school were actively recruited. The public school, on the other hand, had many students. Since the investigator had performed many systematic observations in the first and second grade classes for two years, only those

parents whose children attended the first and second grades were recruited from the public school. In addition, the first and second grades had bilingual classes which were of particular interest. Of the 200 parents recruited from the private school, only 28 fully completed the questionnaires, and of the 200 parents recruited from the public school, 50 completed the questionnaires. Since the original goal was to recruit at least 160 subjects, 100 additional parents from each school were actively recruited. This second round of recruitment efforts yielded 10 fully completed questionnaires from the private school and 19 fully completed questionnaires from the public school. A total of 38 questionnaires were received from the private school and a total of 69 questionnaires were received from the public school yielding a total of 107 fully completed questionnaires for the study. Table 8 reports the demographic data on these 107 subjects.

Table 8

Demographic Data by Group

	Private School		Public School		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender						
Male	10	26.30	18	26.10	28	26.20
Female	28	73.70	51	73.90	79	73.80
Total	38	100	69	100	107	100
Relationship to the Child						
Father	10	26.30	18	26.10	28	26.30
Mother	27	71.10	47	68.10	74	69.20
Other	1	2.60	4	5.80	5	4.70
Total	38	100	69	100	107	100
Ethnic Group						
African American	0	.00	11	15.90	11	10.30
Asian/Pacific Islander	8	21.10	29	42.00	37	34.60
Latino	7	18.40	14	20.30	21	19.60
Euro American	22	57.90	6	8.70	28	26.20
Other	1	2.60	9	13.00	10	9.30
Total	38	100	69	100	107	100

Table 8 (continued)

	Private School		Public School		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Education						
Less than High School	0	.00	13	18.80	13	12.10
High School Graduate	10	26.30	20	29.00	30	28.00
College Graduate	17	44.70	20	29.00	37	34.60
Master's or Professional Degree	11	28.90	16	23.20	27	25.20
Total	38	100	69	100	107	100
Citizenship						
Born in U.S.	25	65.80	20	29.00	45	42.10
Not born in U.S.	13	34.20	49	71.00	62	57.90
Total	38	100	69	100	107	100

Table 8 (continued)

	Private School		Public School		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Years lived in the U.S.						
0-2 years	1	2.60	7	10.10	8	7.50
3-5 years	0	.00	3	4.30	3	2.80
5-10 years	2	5.30	11	15.90	13	12.10
10 plus years	11	28.90	29	42.00	40	37.40
N/A	24	63.20	19	27.50	43	40.20
Total	38	100	69	100	107	100
Countries of Citizenship						
Bangladesh	0	.00	2	2.90	2	1.90
Belize	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
Bolivia	1	2.60	0	.00	1	.90
Cambodia	0	.00	2	2.90	2	1.90
China	0	.00	2	2.90	2	1.90
Cuba	1	2.60	1	1.40	2	1.90
Ecuador	1	2.60	0	.00	1	.90
El Salvador	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
Guatemala	0	.00	2	2.90	2	1.90
Honduras	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
India	2	5.30	6	8.70	8	7.50

Table 8 (continued)

	Private School		Public School		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Countries of Citizenship						
Iran	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
Iraq	0	.00	2	2.90	2	1.90
Jamaica	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
Korea	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
Liberia	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
Mexico	1	2.60	7	10.10	8	7.50
Pakistan	0	.00	10	14.50	10	9.30
Panama	1	2.60	0	.00	1	.90
Philippines	5	13.20	0	.00	5	4.70
Poland	1	2.60	0	.00	1	.90
Romania	0	.00	2	2.90	2	1.90
Somalia	0	.00	2	2.90	2	1.90
Trinidad	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
Ukraine	0	.00	1	1.40	1	.90
United States	25	65.80	19	27.50	44	41.10
Vietnam	0	.00	3	4.30	3	2.80
Total	38	100	69	100	107	100

Procedure

Parents from the public school were recruited in the following manner. In the first round of data collection, parents from two first grade classes, two second grade classes, one Urdu bilingual first/second grade class, and one Spanish bilingual first/second grade class were asked to be participants in the study. Students from these classes were given one packet of questionnaires and instructed to have one of their parents complete the questionnaire. Students were told in person by the investigator that they would receive a reward if they brought completed questionnaires back to school. (The reward was a pencil, though, students were not told this at the time.) A total of 50 fully completed packets were returned from the public school participants.

Parents from the private school were recruited in a different manner. Every Friday, all students receive notes and letters pertaining to functions, news and events about the school in a Friday folder arranged by the secretaries and volunteers at the school. The principal at the school arranged to put a packet of questionnaires into the Friday folder of 200 students. In the cover letter describing the questionnaires, students were asked to return the completed questionnaires in a timely manner. They were told that they would receive a modest reward for doing so. A total of 28 fully completed packets were returned from the private

school participants.

Since only 78 fully completed questionnaires were returned, a second round of recruitment efforts was initiated. In the public school, parents from two third grade classes and parents from an Urdu bilingual third grade class were asked to participate. A total of 100 packets were sent to this potential pool of participants. An announcement was made to the students in these classes. Students were encouraged to have their parents complete the questionnaires. In addition, students were told that they would receive a modest reward for bringing back completed questionnaires. Of the 100 packets sent out, 19 were returned fully completed.

A second recruitment at the private school was also carried out. At the principal's request, parents whose children attended the second, fourth, and fifth grade classes were asked to participate in the study. One hundred packets were sent out. This time, instead of sending the packets home in the Friday folders, the investigator went directly to each of these classes and encouraged students to take home the packets and promptly return them. Students were told that they would receive a modest reward if they brought back completed questionnaires. Of the 100 sent out, 10 were returned.

The packets included the following items: four questionnaires; a demographic sheet; a cover letter giving

directions to the participants; and a brief description of the purpose of the study (See Appendix A). In the cover letter, each parent was asked to complete the questionnaires and to return them to the investigator in a timely manner. Parents were told that the study was designed to identify parents' or guardians' perceptions of their family and school and to describe possible interactions between the two percepts. It should be noted that only one parent or guardian per family was asked to complete the questionnaires. Participants were then asked to give their completed packet of questionnaires to their children who were instructed to return the packets to their teachers. Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed to all participants in that there was no place on the packets for the identification of individuals, classrooms and/or schools.

Instrumentation

The FACES-II (Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale - Second Edition) was developed by Olson et al. (1989) for both research purposes and clinical assessments. It was designed to provide an "insider's perspective" on family functioning as perceived by family members. The conceptual clustering of concepts from family theory and family therapy literature revealed two central dimensions of family behavior: cohesion and adaptability (change). These family dimensions have been used by Olson,

et al. (1989) to develop a comprehensive circumplex model suitable for sociocultural and clinical research. Family cohesion is defined by the authors of the FACES as the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another. Adaptability is defined as the ability of a marital or family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress.

Cohesion and adaptability are independent constructs measured with an integrated 30-item scale that requires rater judgments about aspects of group behavior and functioning that set the social and affective climate of family life. The higher the scores on these dimensions, the healthier the family is described to be. These scores are used in the calculation of a family type score. The higher the family type score, the more balanced the family is functioning and the lower the score, the more extreme and unhealthy the family is functioning. The scale yielded a Cronbach alpha of .90.

Similar to the manner in which Olson examined families, a goal of this study was to obtain an "insider's perspective" related to school functioning. The FACES-II was adapted for use in this study to assess school functioning, and permission was granted permission to adapt this scale from Dr. Olson (See Appendix B). This specially adapted scale called the School FACES-II yielded a

coefficient alpha of .71 (N = 107). Like the FACES-II, it is a 30-item scale that requires parental judgments about aspects of group behavior and functioning along the dimensions of cohesion and adaptability. The difference is that questions are focused on judgments about school behavior and functioning.

The Acculturation Scale, developed by Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, and Aranalde (1980), reportedly measures the gradual adoption by the individual of the more overt and observable aspects of the host culture (American culture), including the host culture's language, customs, habits, and life style. Szapocznik et al (1980) used this scale with a Hispanic immigrant community in the Miami, Florida area. The scale yielded an internal consistency coefficient alpha of .97. Since I examined many ethnic groups, the scale was adapted for use in this study and I was given permission to adapt this scale from Dr. Szapocznik (See Appendix B). The internal consistency estimate for the adapted Acculturation Scale (N = 107) was .96. Although all the questions remained the same on the adapted scale, the responses were modified to some extent from the original version. For example, on the original version of the Acculturation Scale, respondents were asked how often they prefer to speak either English and/or Spanish. So that people who spoke different languages could respond to this scale, respondents were asked how often they prefered to speak either English or

their native language.

The School Satisfaction Questionnaire was also specially constructed for use in this study. It is a 5-item scale that asks parents to rate their satisfaction of their children's schools based on likert-type scoring. Additional questions are asked of parents who are immigrants to the U.S. These questions ask parents to rate their satisfaction with American schools as compared to their home country's schools.

A Demographic Information sheet was included in the packet of questionnaires. It asked parents to identify their gender, relationship to the child attending the school under investigation, their race/ethnicity, their highest level of education attained, their country or countries of citizenship, and how long they have lived in the U.S. if they were born in another country.

The above scales and questionnaires will be helpful in understanding the systemic functioning of the school and family, the correlation or overlap of perception between the two, and how culture and acculturation influence the functioning of the systems. If the school and family are perceived by parents to be functioning optimally then it is hypothesized that parents also will be more satisfied with them.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Carlson (1992) found that we can better help a child who is having difficulties if we better understand the two main systems the child is in: the family and school. Much research has been conducted on how the family influences a child, but little has been done on how the school influences the child and family. Quinnan, et al. (1994) addressed this unknown area by observing two schools and their interactions with families. Five major themes that evolved in their study were: (1) school environment, (2) parent-school interactions, (3) teacher expectations of children and families, (4) teacher-student interactions, and (5) teaching methodology. Overall, their major finding was that each school functioned different systemically possibly as a result of the different families who attended the schools.

Extending Quinnan's, et al. (1994) research, a main hypothesis tested in this study asks which variables, such as the ethnicity and acculturation levels of the parents, influenced family and school systemic functioning the most (Null Hypothesis One). After examining Null Hypothesis One, more specific hypotheses were tested utilizing different

statistics and thereby giving further support. For example, Null Hypothesis Two tests whether there are significant differences in family and school functioning as a result of the ethnicity of the families. Null Hypothesis Three tests for significant relationships between the acculturation levels of the parents and school and family functioning. Extending Carlson's (1992) theory that families and schools function and are structured similarily, Null Hypothesis Four asks whether there is a significant relationship between family and school functioning. After all, as systems theory indicates as all human systems are interactive, one system cannot influence another without it somehow being changed in turn. Quinnan, et al. (1994) found that each school differed systemically and in school culture. Null Hypothesis Five tests for these differences, however, rather than through researchers' observations, this study asks for the parents' perceptions of their children's schools. Lastly, it is hypothesized that parents will be more satisfied with their schools if they perceive their schools as functioning in an adaptive, flexible, and cohesive manner (Null Hypothesis Six). The following are scales and questionnaires that will be used to assess and test these hypotheses: (1) Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale (FACES-II) to assess family functioning, (2) School FACES-II to assess school functioning, (3) an Acculturation Scale, and (4) a School Satisfaction Questionnaire.

The study sample consisted of 107 subjects (38 parents from a suburban private Catholic school and 69 parents from an urban public school). These were the same schools examined in Quinnan's, et al. (1994) study. The results related to testing the null hypotheses based on all the dependent measures are detailed in the following section.

Results Related to Testing Null Hypothesis One

Since family and school systemic functioning were of primary interest, this study sought to examine which variables, if any, influenced family and school functioning the most. This led to the first null hypothesis which states that Acculturation scores, cultural groups, educational levels, and School Satisfaction scores will not have an influence on FACES-II and School FACES-II scores. Four multiple regression analyses were conducted with the FACES-II cohesion and adaptability scores and the School FACES-II cohesion and adaptability scores as the four dependent variables. For each of the analyses, Acculturation scores, cultural groups, educational levels, and School Satisfaction scores served as the independent variables. Tables 9 to 12 show the results of the four multiple regression analyses.

Table 9

Multiple Regression F-tests and t-tests with FACES-II Adaptability Scores as the Dependent Variable

	F	p	t	p	
	.69	.71			
Educ1			-1.00	.32	-.13
Educ2			-.54	.59	-.07
Educ3			-1.47	.14	-.17
Culture1			1.25	.21	.20
Culture2			.17	.87	.03
Culture3			.52	.60	.09
Culture4			.01	.99	.00
Acculturation Scores			-.33	.74	-.05
Satisfaction Scores			.62	.54	.06

Table 10

Multiple Regression F-tests and t-tests with FACES-II Cohesion Scores as the Dependent Variable

	F	p	t	p	
	1.55	.14			
Educ1			.21	.83	.03
Educ2			.30	.76	.04
Educ3			-1.99	.05	-.23*
Culture1			.18	.86	.03
Culture2			.68	.49	.12
Culture3			-.59	.55	-.10
Culture4			-.33	.74	-.04
Acculturation Scores			.14	.89	.02
Satisfaction Scores			1.63	.11	.16

* $p < .05$.

Table 11

Multiple Regression F-tests and t-tests with School FACES-II Adaptability Scores as the Dependent Variable

	F	p	t	p	
	7.25	.00***			
Educ1			.77	.44	.08
Educ2			-.77	.44	-.08
Educ3			.49	.63	.05
Culture1			-.45	.65	-.06
Culture2			-.31	.76	-.04
Culture3			-.24	.81	-.03
Culture4			.31	.76	.03
Acculturation Scores			-2.84	.01	-.34**
Satisfaction Scores			5.41	.00	.44***

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 12

Multiple Regression F-tests and t-tests with School FACES-II Cohesion Scores as the Dependent Variable

	F	p	t	p	
	7.47	.00***			
Educ1			.83	.41	.08
Educ2			-.66	.51	-.07
Educ3			.17	.86	.02
Culture1			.17	.86	.02
Culture2			-.30	.76	-.04
Culture3			.20	.84	.03
Culture4			-.54	.59	-.06
Acculturation Scores			-.39	.69	-.05
Satisfaction Scores			7.32	.00	.596***

*** $p < .001$.

The results from the four multiple regression analyses show which variables were most influential to family and school systemic functioning. Table 9 demonstrates that although some variables influence FACES-II adaptability scores more heavily than others, none are significant at the .05 level. Table 10 shows that the educational level of parents significantly influences FACES-II cohesion scores. More specifically, college educated parents (Educ3) tend to have lower scores on the FACES-II cohesion scale than the rest of the parents in this sample. Table 11 indicates that

both School Satisfaction Scores (t = 5.41, p < .001) and Acculturation Scores (t = -2.84, p < .01) significantly influence School FACES-II adaptability scores. Table 12 shows that as Satisfaction Scores increase, School FACES-II Cohesion scores increase as well (t = - 7.32, p < .001).

There are many variables that influence family and school functioning. As the results from Null Hypothesis One demonstrated, however, education appears to influence FACES-II cohesion scores the most, Acculturation and Satisfaction Scores affect School FACES-II adaptability scores the most, and Satisfaction Scores influence School FACES-II cohesion scores the most.

Results Related to Testing Null Hypothesis Two

The second null hypothesis states that ethnicity will not significantly influence family and school systemic functioning. More specifically, it states that there will be no difference in the FACES-II and the School FACES-II scores across cultural groups. Means and standard deviations for each cultural group are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations of FACES-II and School FACES-II Scores Across Cultural Groups

	FACES-II Scores			
	Cohesion		Adaptability	
	M	SD	M	SD
African American	64.00	7.29	48.45	5.72
Asian/Pacific Islander	63.03	8.08	49.76	6.67
Latino	65.43	10.22	51.62	6.53
Euro American	68.11	7.52	48.65	5.74
Other	64.70	10.48	48.40	6.02
Total	65.08	8.64	49.57	6.25
	School FACES-II Scores			
	Cohesion		Adaptability	
	M	SD	M	SD
African American	52.91	5.56	48.00	6.74
Asian/Pacific Islander	54.00	8.95	48.43	7.72
Latino	54.90	7.28	48.52	6.08
Euro American	50.50	11.49	42.75	8.64
Other	53.00	8.76	47.20	8.06
Total	53.06	9.11	46.80	7.88

A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted on the scores from the FACES-II and School Faces-II. The grouping factor or independent variable was the cultural group (African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Latino, Euro American and Other), and the dependent variables or measures were the scores obtained from the FACES-II and School FACES-II. Table 14 contains the Wilks Lambda Values, F-values, and p-value levels of significance for these scales.

Table 14

MANOVA Dependent Variables FACES-II and School FACES-II Across Cultural Groups

Factor		F	df	p
Cultural Group	.77	1.72	16.00	.04*

* $p < .05$.

The Cultural Group factor ($F = 1.72$, $p = .04$) was found to be significant at the .05 level of significance on the FACES-II and School FACES-II scores. This indicates that group effects were not consistent across scores for the FACES-II and School FACES-II. Table 11 contains the F-values and significance levels (p-values) for the four univariate F-tests on the four scores (two from the FACES-II and two from the School FACES-II), with cultural groups used as the grouping factor or independent variable.

Table 15

ANOVA Univariate F-tests, FACES-II and School FACES-II

(Univariate F-tests Dependent Variables: FACES-II and School FACES-II Scores; Grouping Factor: Cultural Groups)

Subscale Scores	F	p
FACES-II		
Adaptability	.89	.47
Cohesion	1.46	.22
School FACES-II		
Adaptability	2.74	.03*
Cohesion	.86	.49

Note. Univariate F-tests with (4,102) df.
* $p < .05$.

Of the four univariate F-tests appearing in Table 15, only one (adaptability scale from the School FACES-II) was found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. This finding indicates that the School FACES-II adaptability scores contributed the most to the multivariate significance. To isolate more specifically where the differences were, post-hoc tests were conducted to determine which pairs of means significantly differed. For each of the four dependent variables (FACES-II adaptability and cohesion scores and School FACES-II adaptability and

cohesion scores), 10 independent sample t-tests were computed testing for differences in means across the two cultural groups. The t-test values and p-values for the comparisons that were found to be statistically significant are reported in Table 16.

The results in Table 16 indicate that members of the Asian/Pacific Islander or Latino cultural group rated or perceived their schools to be more adaptive than members of the Euro American cultural group as indicated by their scores on the School FACES-II adaptability scale. In other words, compared to Euro Americans, members in these two groups perceived their schools to be better able and more flexible with respect to changing its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational or developmental stress. Culture, therefore, seemed to have an influence on how parents perceived their school to be functioning. In addition, the Euro Americans' FACES-II cohesion scores were found to be significantly higher than the Asian/Pacific Islanders' scores.

Past research demonstrated differences in family functioning across cultural groups (Florian, Mikulincer, and Weller, 1993). However, other studies (Vega, et al., 1986) showed that the differences had more to do with the acculturation level of the family. Remember that Null Hypothesis Three was crafted to examine the influence acculturation level has on family functioning. Overall, the

results reported in Tables 14, 15, and 16 lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis. There do appear to be significant differences in the FACES-II scores (family and school versions) across cultural groups (F = 1.72, p < .05).

Table 16

t-test values and p-values for FACES-II and School FACES-II Scores Between Cultural Groups

Cultural Groups	FACES-II or School FACES-II
Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 37)	FACES-II (cohesion)
Euro American (n = 28)	t = -2.58, p < .01**, df (2,63)
Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 37)	School FACES-II (adaptability)
Euro American (n = 28)	t = 2.79, p <.01**, df (2,63)
Latino (n = 21)	School FACES-II (adaptability)
Euro American (n = 28)	t = -2.61, p < .01**, df (2,47)

** p < .01.

Results Related to Testing Null Hypotheses Three and Four

The third null hypothesis states that there will be no relationship between family functioning and the acculturation levels of the parents, nor will be there any relationship between school functioning and the acculturation levels of the parents. In other words, the third null hypothesis states that there will be no relationship between the FACES-II scores and the

Acculturation scores and between the School FACES-II and the Acculturation scores. The fourth null hypothesis states that there will be no relationship between the FACES-II and the School FACES-II scores. Table 17 presents the Pearson r correlation coefficients for the scores on the Acculturation Scale and scores on the FACES-II and School FACES-II scales.

An examination of the results indicates that there is a negative or inverse relationship between the acculturation scores and school adaptability scores ($r = -.41$, $p < .001$) and school cohesion scores ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$) obtained from the School FACES-II scale. This finding supports the notion that parents who are less acculturated to the American culture appear to perceive their schools as functioning more adaptively and cohesively than parents who are more acculturated.

Significant positive correlations were also found between the family adaptability and family cohesion scores ($r = .58$, $p < .001$), and the school adaptability and the school cohesion scores ($r = .73$, $p < .001$). In other words, parents who perceived their families and schools as high functioning on the adaptability scale also perceived them to be functioning high on the cohesion scale. Likewise, parents who rated their families and schools to be functioning low on the adaptability scale, also rated them low on the cohesion scale.

Finally, a significant positive correlation was found

between the school adaptability and the family adaptability scores (r = .35, p < .001). In other words, parents who perceived their families as adaptable also perceived their schools as adaptive. Taken together, these results lead to a rejection of null hypotheses three and four.

Table 17

Pearson r Correlation Coefficients Between Acculturation, FACES-II and School FACES-II Scores

		FACES-II		School FACES-II	
	Accult.	Adapt.	Coh.	Adapt.	Coh.
Acculturation	--	-.12	.17	-.41	-.20
		p=.21	p=.09	p=.00***	p=.04*
FACES-II					
Adaptability	-.12	--	.57	.35	.15
	p=.21		p=.00***	p=.35	p=.11
Cohesion	.17	.57	--	.15	.08
	p=.09	p=.00***		p=.13	p=.43
School FACES-II					
Adaptability	-.41	.35	.15	--	.73
	p=.00***	p=.00***	p=.13		p=.00***
Cohesion	-.20	.15	.08	.73	--
	p=.04*	p=.12	p=.43	p=.00***	

* p < .05. *** p < .001.

Results Related to Testing Null Hypothesis Five

The fifth null hypothesis states that there will be no differences in the School FACES-II scores between parents from the public school and parents from the private school. As noted earlier, since the two schools selected for this study were observed to function differently, it was expected that there would be significant differences in how the parents from each school perceived their school to be functioning. Originally, the private school was hypothesized to function in a more collaboratively or in a more flexibly connected manner and the public school was hypothesized to function in a more hierarchical or structurally separated manner. It should be noted that both ways of functioning are within the balanced range on the Olson's Circumplex Model. Unfortunately, research has shown that since the FACES-II (and therefore the School FACES-II) did not capture extremely high scores on the cohesion and adaptability scales, the manner of scoring and categorizing the level of functioning differs. As a result of this situation, it makes sense to hypothesize that on both scales, the private school would be perceived as higher functioning by parents than the public school. For example, the private school was observed to function in a collaborative function. The teachers, parents, and staff members appeared to relate to each other in a collegial and informal manner addressing each other on a first name basis

and asking each other for opinions on how the school should best function. Given this set of observations, it was hypothesized that parents would perceive their school to function high on the cohesion scale on the School FACES-II. On the adaptability scale, it was hypothesized that parents from the private school would rate their school to be functioning very flexibly due to the observation that the school allows for flexibility in role relationships and school power. It was further hypothesized that this flexibility may be too high to the point of being chaotic. However, it is recognized that the FACES-II instrument would not be able to capture these extremely high scores.

The public school, on the other hand, seemed to function in a more hierarchical manner. Parents did not address teachers on a first name basis, but instead, addressed them formally and rarely questioned how the teachers taught or ran the school. It was hypothesized that parents would rate their school to function lower on the adaptability scale on the School FACES-II since it was observed that the school functioned with more defined rules and role relationships. On the cohesion scale, it was hypothesized that parents would also perceive their school to function lower as parents and teachers appeared to be less connected to each other.

The means and standard deviations obtained from the School FACES-II scores are presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Means and Standard Deviations from the School FACES-II Scores Across Schools

	School FACES-II			
	Adaptability		Cohesion	
	M	SD	M	SD
Public School	48.26	7.22	53.71	8.28
Private School	44.16	8.42	51.87	10.47
Total	46.80	7.89	53.06	9.11

The results of the MANOVA procedure displayed in Table 19 indicate that there are significant differences between schools ($F = 4.45$, $p < .01$). The findings related to the univariate F-tests presented in Table 20 indicate that it was primarily the school adaptability scores that contributed to the multivariate significance ($F = 7.02$, $p < .001$). In other words, public school parents' scores on the School FACES-II adaptability scale were significantly higher than private school parents' scores. Given these findings, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected. It should be noted that these empirically determined findings are discrepant from Quinnan's, et al. (1994) qualitative findings and observations.

Table 19

MANOVA Dependent Variable School FACES-II Scores Across Schools

Factor		F	df	p
School	.92	4.45	2	.01**

** p < 01.

Table 20

ANOVA Univariate F-tests, School FACES-II Scores

School FACES-II Scores	F	p
Cohesion	1.00	.32
Adaptability	7.02	.01**

** p < .01.

Results Related to Testing Null Hypothesis Six

The sixth null hypothesis states that there will be no relationship between the School FACES-II and the School Satisfaction Questionnaire scores. In other words, it is hypothesized that there will be no relationship between parents' perception of school functioning and how satisfied they are with the school. An examination of the Pearson r correlations indicate that there is a significant positive correlation between the scores on the School Satisfaction

Questionnaire and scores on the Adaptability and Cohesion scales on the School FACES-II. A multiple regression analysis of the data set further indicated that the School Satisfaction Questionnaire scores depended more on the cohesion scores which accounted for 50.70% of the variance than on adaptability scores which accounted for 14.70% of the variance. In other words, parents who perceived their schools to be functioning in a more cohesive manner were more satisfied with their schools. It seemed that parents' satisfaction with their schools depended more on how connected and involved with the school and school members they were than on how flexible the school was with respect to its rules and role relationships. Table 21 presents the Pearson r correlation coefficients. Table 22 displays the Multiple Regression coefficients. Based on these results, the sixth null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 21

Pearson r Correlation Coefficients between School FACES-II Scores and School Satisfaction Questionnaire Scores

	Pearson r Correlation Coefficients			
	School FACES-II			
	Adaptability		Cohesion	
School Satisfaction Questionnaire	.52	p=.00***	.61	p=.00***

*** p < .001.

Table 22

Multiple Regression F-test and t-tests

(Dependent Variable=School Satisfaction Questionnaire Scores, Independent Variables=Adaptability and Cohesion Scores from the School FACES-II)

	F	p	t	p	
	32.97	.000			
Adaptability			1.30	.19	.15
Cohesion			4.49	.00***	.51

*** p < .001.

In summary, the six null hypotheses were rejected. This indicates that culture, acculturation, and the type of school the students attended influenced how the parents perceived their families and children's schools to be functioning. In addition, parents who perceived their schools to be functioning in a healthy, cohesive and adaptive manner were more satisfied with their schools than if their schools were not functioning well.

More specifically, the following significant results were found. First, it appeared that Asian and Latino groups rated their schools as more adaptive than the Euro American group according to their higher scores on the School FACES-II adaptability scale. In addition to culture having an impact on perceptions, it also appeared that acculturation

level influenced how parents perceived their schools to be functioning. The less acculturated parents were to the American culture, the more adaptable and cohesive they perceived their schools to be. Second, contrary to what I expected, it appeared that Euro Americans' scores on the FACES-II cohesion scale were higher than Asians' scores. It was hypothesized that all minority cultural groups would score higher on the cohesion scale based on the hypothesis that these groups came from more collectivist societies that had closer family networks. This was not the case. Acculturation level also did not appear to influence how parents perceived their families to be functioning. Third, significant positive correlations were found between FACES-II cohesion and adaptability scores and between School FACES-II cohesion and adaptability scores. In other words, parents who perceived their families and schools to be cohesive also perceived their families and schools to be adaptable. Although this finding was not completely unexpected, cohesion and adaptability are considered to be separate constructs. Fourth, parents who perceived their schools as adaptable also perceived their families as adaptable. Fifth, public school parents had significantly higher scores on the School FACES-II adaptability scale than private school parents. This was contrary to what I expected since I observed that the private school seemed to be more flexible and adaptable in its approach to teaching

and collaborating with parents than the public school's manner of functioning. Sixth, significant positive correlations were found between the School Satisfaction scores and the School FACES-II cohesion and adaptability scores. In addition, satisfaction scores depended more on cohesion than adaptability. In other words, parents' satisfaction with their schools depended more on how cohesive the school was rather than how adaptable it was.

These results have important implications for how we understand families and schools and how the interaction or correlation between the two may or may not have an influence on how a child functions in both environments. The next section will examine the implications of these results more carefully, recommend areas of future research, and discuss the strengths and limitations of the study.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Since family and school systemic functioning were the primary areas of interest, the findings from Null Hypothesis One will be discussed first followed by the most significant findings that relate to the findings from Null Hypothesis One. Next, the strengths and limitations of this study will be presented along with recommendations for future research.

This study extends Quinnan's, et al. (1994) qualitative study which observed two schools (one public and one private) on the North side of Chicago. Their research, which examined the interrelationship between family and school functioning, found that each school had a distinct culture which the researchers believed may have been a result of the families who attended the schools. In other words, as systems theory states, systems influence each other which in turn may change each other. Rather than attempt to observe the interactions that take place at the schools, the present study asked the parents whose children attended these same two schools what their perceptions were of their families and schools through the use of scales and questionnaires. In addition, a central aspect of the study was to determine whether ethnicity and level of

acculturation influenced parents' perception of family and school functioning and satisfaction with the schools. Since participants in this study came from two very different types of schools, focus was given to possible differences in perceptions of school functioning across schools.

Factors Influencing Family Functioning

Since family and school systemic functioning were the primary areas of interest, this study tested which variables influenced these areas the most. In addition, this project tested Quinnan's, et al. (1994) hypothesis that families and schools influence one another and subsequently change the manner in which they function. The parents or participants in this study came from various ethnic groups and had varying educational levels which made the group as a whole very diverse. Although education was not an initial variable of interest, since the parents had varying educational levels, it was decided that it should be taken into account. Education seemed to only affect or influence how cohesive families were (FACES-II cohesion scores). In other words, parents who had a college education as compared to the other parents in this sample had lower cohesion scores. There does not appear to be any research that examines the influence educational level has on family functioning. Olson, et al. (1989), however, found that families who had greater resources and coping strategies functioned better. Generalizing from this, it would seem

that parents who were more educated might have more resources and better coping strategies. This did not appear to be the case in this study.

Although the multiple regression analyses from Null Hypothesis One found that acculturation levels did not appear to significantly influence family functioning, other more specific analyses did show that parents from different cultural groups significantly differed in terms of their FACES-II scores.

On the FACES-II cohesion scale, for example, Euro Americans scored significantly higher than the Asian/Pacific Islander group (from now on this group will be referred to as Asians) ($t = -2.58$, $p < .01$). This finding indicated that Euro American parents perceived their families to be more cohesive than Asians. Although to date, there does not appear to be any studies examining the comparison between the Asian and Euro American families, based on Triandis' (1990) analysis of cultures and Florian, et al.'s (1993) study using the FACES-II it was hypothesized that Euro Americans would score lower on the cohesion scale. In Chapter 2, it was noted that Asians tend to be collaborative and cohesive with family members. Families are considered to be so tight that a male child has distinct obligations and duties to his parents that assume a higher value than obligations to his siblings, children and/or wife. In addition, when we use Triandis' analysis of cultures, we

would expect the following: (1) that the Asian culture as compared to the Euro American culture would be more specific in terms of social roles, (2) more collectivist than individualistic in terms of one's relationships with others, (3) more homogenous in terms of beliefs and cultural practices, (4) and more extended rather than nuclear in terms of the family network. All these factors lead to the hypothesis that Asians would score higher on the FACES-II cohesion scale than Euro Americans. This finding from the present study, however, does not support this hypothesis. As Vega, et al. (1986) showed, though, acculturation may play a role in how the families scored. In other words, the Asian subjects used in this study, may have been more acculturated to the majority culture. In addition, as the contents of Table 8 demonstrated, of the subjects who were born in another country, the majority have lived in the U.S. for more than ten years which would give them plenty of time to assimilate and acculturate to the majority culture if they desired to do so. It should be noted that perhaps one important reason for the differences in scores among cultural groups is that each culture perceives family and cohesion differently. For example, what one culture may perceive as healthy and balanced, another culture may not. It is important to address that at least in this sample, although there were significant differences between cultures, all functioned in a balanced and healthy manner.

Examining these differences more specifically in the future could help determine what more specific details differentiate the groups.

Factors Influencing School Functioning

The variables that appeared to influence parents' perception of how adaptive their schools functioned (based on the results obtained from Null Hypothesis One) were their satisfaction with the school and their acculturation levels. The more acculturated parents were to the American culture, the less likely parents were to see their schools as functioning adaptively. Other tests supported this claim which found significant differences between certain cultural groups on the School FACES-II adaptability scale. For example, Asians (who were less aculturated to the American culture than Euro Americans) scored higher than Euro Americans ($t = 2.79$, $p < .001$), and Latinos also scored higher than Euro Americans ($t = -2.61$, $p < .01$) on this scale. Both Asians and Latinos perceived their schools to function more adaptively and flexibly than Euro Americans did. In other words, Asians and Latinos (who were mostly immigrants) seemed to feel that it was easy to express their feelings and opinions at their schools, that discipline was fair and flexible, and that the schools' approaches to problem solving were flexible and fair. A closer examination of Asians' and Latinos' comments regarding their feelings about the United States' schools verifies and gives

more credence to the above results. Based on their individual comments and high satisfaction scores on the School Satisfaction Questionnaire, immigrant parents seemed to be quite satisfied with American schools as compared to their home country's schools. Some parents stated that American schools as compared to the schools in their home country discipine students more fairly, more flexibly, and in a more civilized manner which they were pleased about. Some parents stated that schools in their home country used corporal punishment to discipline which these parents felt was ineffective and wrong.

Parents were not only more satisfied with their schools if they also say their schools as functioning adaptively, but they were even more satisfied if they believed their schools were functioning in a flexible and cohesive manner. A series of multiple regression analyses confirmed that cohesion compared to adaptability played a more important role in terms of the satisfaction of the schools. In other words, the closeness and connectedness parents felt with the school was more important than the adaptability and flexibility of the school with respect to determining how satisfied they would be with the school. Olson (1980) found a correlation between family satisfaction and higher scores on the FACES-II instrument. In other words, the healthier and more balanced the family is perceived to be functioning, the happier and more satisfied the family is. In an effort

to generalize from Olson's research program, this study tested if his findings pertained to school functioning as well. The results from the present study did confirm this. Hughes, Wikeley, and Nash (1994) reported that parents' satisfaction with their children's schools depended more on the relationships they had with the staff and the relationships in the school in general than on more concrete aspects such as supplies and teaching methods. It would seem logical to assume then that if parents perceived their school to be functioning adaptively and cohesively in terms of relationships among school members, then they would be more satisfied with the school.

Comparison of Adaptability and Cohesion Scores

There were significant positive correlations between the FACES-II cohesion and adaptability scales and between the School FACES-II adaptability and cohesion scales. Some correlation between these scales would seem likely because they are a part of the same measure. However, studies have shown that these two dimensions are independent. In two separate studies conducted by Russell (1978, 1979) that utilized self-report and behavioral measures of both cohesion and adaptability, factor analysis revealed that measures of these dimensions loaded on separate factors. It would appear from this study that parents who perceived their families as cohesive also perceived them as adaptable and likewise for their schools. In other words, at least in

this sample, families who are functional and healthy on one dimension appear to be healthy and functional on the other.

The Correlation Between Family and School Functioning

Another significant positive correlation was found between the School FACES-II adaptability scores and the FACES-II adaptability scores. Based on Quinnan's, et al. (1994) qualitative results, it appeared that schools functioned partly as a result of the differential make-up of family systems and the strengths and weaknesses of the students who attended the schools. For example, the public school appeared to function in a more hierarchical and formal manner both among school staff and in terms of the school's interactions with parents. Parents were primarily from various minority culture groups and were less educated than the parents from the private school who were predominantly Euro American. It was further observed at the public school that parents from minority culture groups seemed to address other parents and teachers in a more formal and hierarchical manner addressing teachers with formal titles. As a result of this formal and hierarchical manner of functioning, it was hypothesized that parents at the public school would perceive the school as scoring lower on the adaptability scale on the School FACES-II instrument. For example, they would perceive their school as being more rigid and formal and less collaborative with regards to how the school makes decisions and handles problems. Parents

appeared to expect that principals and teachers knew what was best for the students, and therefore, the parents seemed to allow the school staff to make important decisions without as much collaboration with parents. Deal's (1990) research confirmed our observations. He found that public schools, as compared to private schools, functioned with "rational bonds" or top-down "rules, roles, functions, penalties, and formal authority." He found that private schools, on the other hand, functioned by what he called "cultural bonds" or "shared purposes, values, traditions and history" that promote a strong sense of community. Our observations of private schools confirmed this. The private school appeared to function in a more collaborative manner where the roles and boundaries seemed to be less rigid. Again, because the families at each school were markedly different, it was hypothesized that this would influence how the school would function in response to these differences. For the most part, our results confirmed this hypothesis. However, the findings were not in the direction we anticipated. The analyses performed on the data set to test null hypothesis four demonstrated that public school parents' ratings of their school on the School FACES-II adaptability scale were significantly higher than private school parents' ratings.

It is important to address why Quinnan's, et al. (1994) observations of the schools differed from the parents'

observations of the schools. First, it should be noted that Quinnan's observations took place in the main offices and classrooms of the two schools. In the office and at school functions such as PTA meetings, the researchers observed the interactions between staff and parents. Many of the same parents consistently came to the offices and school functions and were very involved with their schools. Perhaps the questionnaires that parents sent back for this study were from parents who did not come to the school often, however, they did want to make their comments known. In other words, the parents that were observed at the schools may have been different from the parents who actually completed the questionnaires. At least at the private school, it appeared that the parents who completed the questionnaires were parents who seemed somewhat dissatisfied with the school. Some actually stated that they felt that only the parents who were at the school often were the ones who got along well with staff members and agreed more with school policies.

A second reason for the differences between Quinnan's, et al. (1994) perceptions and parents' perceptions of the schools may pertain to the classrooms which parents' children came from. At the public school, most of the parents who completed the questionnaires came from classrooms that were very cohesive. Most of these classrooms were bilingual/bicultural classrooms where the

teachers had much contact with parents and parents had much contact with each other. This observation would lead to the hypothesis then that the public school as opposed to the private school would score higher on the FACES-II scale. Even though Quinnan's, et al. (1994) perception of the parent-staff interactions in the office and school functions was that of being more hierarchical and formal, perhaps when we examine individual classroom parent-staff interactions, the perceptions would differ. In other words, in a large school such as this particular public school that was examined in this study, there appear to be subsystems within the larger system and perhaps these subsystems need to be examined more closely.

Based on the above two explanations, it would appear then that the private school parents' perceptions of the school were that of being less cohesive and adaptable in functioning than the public school parents' perceptions. Since this study's hypotheses were formulated based on Quinnan's, et al. (1994) perceptions and before knowing which parents would participate in this study, it seems reasonable that the results might come out different than expected.

Discussion of the Strengths and Limitations of the Study and Areas for Future Research

The above discussion of the results has important implications for future research and areas needed to be

focused on when working with parents, staff, and students in the schools. Before discussing the limitations of this study, it is important first to recognize its strengths. A major advantage of this study is that its hypotheses were solidly grounded in qualitative and quantitative research. In other words, Quinnan's et al. (1994) observations were further supported in this study statistically. In addition, the many statistically significant results that were obtained were highly significant often at the .001 level. This indicates that the chance that the significant findings occurred by chance are less than 1%. Another strength of this study were the measures used. Most had high coefficient alpha levels indicating reliable and valid tests. As a result of these strengths, we should feel confident that the findings that were obtained are indicative of important areas. In other words, the results indicate that this subject area is one worth pursuing as the mesosystemic functioning of schools and families and the variables that influence it strongly affect the two major systems a child interacts in. Therefore, for professionals working with children, it is important to understand these variables so that children will get better treatment.

Although there are many strengths to this study, there were limitations. Along with examining these limitations, implications for future research will be addressed. Several limitations are recognized with respect to the sample.

Although the total sample size was relatively large (N = 107), there were considerably more respondents from the public school (n = 69) than the private school (n = 38). In addition, respondents from the public school came from parents whose children attended the first through third grades whereas respondents from the private school came from parents whose children attended the first through eighth grade classes. As a result, the parents from these two schools may perceive their schools differently as well as have a different family make-up. For example, parents who have children in the lower grades may not have as much experience or knowledge of the school. One parent responded, on the School FACES-II instrument, "My child is in pre-school, therefore, these questions are difficult to answer." Another parent responded on the School FACES-II instrument, "My kids are new to the school so I am only guessing at some answers."

There were other problems pertaining to parents having some difficulty responding to the School FACES-II instrument. For example, some parents indicated that they did not go to the school enough. They claimed that they did not know enough about how the school functioned. Other parents checked off item numbers that they felt applied to their school instead of rating each item number. These invalidated scales could not be used in the final analysis of data sets. For example, one parent checked off item one

which states "School members and parents of the school are supportive of each other during difficult times." As a result of these comments and suggestions, it appears that perhaps only parents who had much contact and experience with the school responded to the School FACES-II. These situational variables may have biased the final test results.

The School FACES-II instrument included questions that related to the relationship among faculty, staff, and parents. In hindsight, it would have been interesting to have two School FACES-II versions: (1) the School FACES-II that was used in this study, and (2) one that asked just the staff at the school to complete the scale in reference to their assessment of the relationship among staff members only. In this way, the atmosphere and structure of how the staff relates to each other as well as any systemic difficulties within the school could have been assessed. For example, item number one stated, "School members and parents of the school are supportive of each other during difficult times." The question could have been reworded instead to state, "Staff at the school are supportive of each other during difficult times." This was considered as a result of a few parents who stated they were confused by the wording of some of the questions. For example, one parent stated on the School FACES-II, " Does school members refer to students, or does school members refer to school

board members or teachers? You need to clarify."

Another limitation of the study relates to how the cultural groups were divided. Respondents were divided into the following cultural groups: (1) African American; (2) Asian/Pacific Islander; (3) Latino; (4) Euro American; and (5) Other. Within each major cultural group, were various other subcultures. For example, in the Asian/Pacific Islander group, parents came from countries such as India, Iran, Pakistan, the Philippines, and China. Each of these countries obviously have very different cultures, beliefs, practices and values. However, these differences could not be gleaned. Finally, it should be noted that parents were divided into such large cultural groups so that there would be enough subjects per group to analyze.

Based on Quinnan's, et al. (1994) comparative qualitative analysis of the two schools, it was observed that each school functioned differently. It was hypothesized that the private school functioned in a more collaborative and flexibly connected manner and the public school functioned in a more hierarchical and structurally separated way. These systemic ways of functioning in the schools could have been better assessed by Olson's curvilinear model as opposed to his linear model as assessed by the FACES-II and School FACES-II. The second version of the FACES-II was recommended by Olson since the reliability and validity of this version was reported to be better than

the third and later editions which was designed to assess functioning in a curvilinear manner. As a result, the schools could not be assessed to address the type of functioning we observed (i.e., flexibly connected verses structurally separated). Now that more information has been gleaned about family and school functioning and how culture, acculturation level, type of school, and educational level all influence how these systems are perceived by parents, it would be interesting to actually begin using these instruments for clinical practice. Once further revisions and modifications are done on the School FACES-II, hopefully school psychologists will find it helpful in gathering more information about school functioning and how this functioning influences parents' and staff's feelings about schools. In addition, the School FACES-II and FACES-II could be completed by parents when their child is having a problem in the classroom. When examining how their family functions and how the school/classroom functions, parents and staff will be better able to see how the similarity or discrepancy in how the two systems function could lead to difficulties for a child. As the case example in Chapter 1 shows, the two environments a child most operates in are the home and school environments. If the child receives mixed signals from each environment or if both systems are dysfunctional, a child could begin to have a very difficult time functioning in both. The FACES-

II and School FACES-II could help determine if these two systems are dysfunctional and how this could be affecting the child. Ultimately, the more information we have about the way people and systems work and the more instruments we have to objectively obtain this information, the better able we will be to help families, students, and staff work together to build a strong home-school collaborative network that works together for the betterment of schools and ultimately children's future.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE PACKET OF MEASURES TO SUBJECTS

Sample Packet of Measures to Subjects

Dear parents or guardians:

Allow me to introduce myself. My name is Julie Lackaff and I am a graduate student in school psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. I have been an active participant at your child's school and have spent over two years there observing the teachers, administrators and classrooms. I have found this school to be one of the best I have seen in terms of the curriculum, discipline, and most especially the quality of teaching. I would like to learn even more about the school and in particular how parents or guardians perceive this school. I feel that the more we know about your perceptions and what you would like for your child, the better quality education we can provide. With your help, I would like to know how you perceive this school, and I would like to use your comments and responses in a research project.

More specifically, this research project involves parents or guardians completing various questionnaires regarding their family and school. The research is looking to identify parents' or guardians' perceptions of their family and school, and how the two interact. This study also seeks parents' or guardians' level of acculturation and parents' or guardians' suggestions on how to improve their childrens' schools. I will administer the questionnaires to the children at their school. The children will then take home the questionnaires and give them to you to complete. **I am asking that only <u>one</u> parent or guardian complete these questionnaires.** Once completed, parents or guardians will then give them back to their children to take back to school. Teachers will then collect the questionnaires from the children, and when most of the class returns the questionnaires, the children will get a small reward. Teachers will then give the questionnaires back to me.

The respondents' (parents or guardians) answers to the questionnaires will be kept anonymous and confidential. The questionnaires contain no place for the identification of particular individuals, classrooms or schools, but instead will be identified by a number. Although this study could be published someday or presented at a conference, there is no possibility that your name or school will be identified. The information will be given to your school principals to provide them with potentially helpful feedback about parents' and guardians' perceptions of their school. Again, your name would not be identified.

At any time you may contact Julie Lackaff at (312) 274-0696 if you have any questions regarding the study.

Thank you for your time. I look forward to your comments and a better understanding of how we can provide for a better education for your child.

Sincerely,

Julie Lackaff
Graduate Student in School Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

FACES II: FAMILY VERSION

David H. Olson, Joyce Portner & Richard Bell

1	2	3	4	5
Almost Never	**Once in Awhile**	**Sometimes**	**Frequently**	**Almost Always**

Describe your family:

___1. Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.
___2. In our family, it is esy for everyone to express his/her opinion.
___3. It is easier to discuss problems with people outside the family than with other family members.
___4. Each family member has input regarding major family decisions.
___5. Our family gathers together in the same room.
___6. Children have a say in their discipline.
___7. Our family does things together.
___8. Family members discuss problems and feel good about the solutions.
___9. In our family, everyone goes his/her own way.
___10.We shift household responsibilities from person to person.
___11.Family members know each other's close friends.
___12.It is hard to know what the rules are in our family.
___13.Family members consult other family members on personal decisions.
___14.Family members say what they want.
___15.We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.
___16.In solving problems, the children's suggestions are followed.
___17.Family members feel very close to each other.
___18.Discipline is fair in our family.
___19.Family members feel closer to people outside the family than to other family members.
___20.Our family tries new ways of dealing with problems.
___21.Family members go along with what the family decides to do.
___22.In our family, everyone shares responsibilities.
___23.Family members like to spend their free time with each other.
___24.It is difficult to get a rule changed in our family.
___25.Family members avoid each other at home.
___26.When problems arise, we compromise.
___27.We approve of each other's friends.
___28.Family members are afraid to say what is on their minds.
___29.Family members pair up rather than do things as a total family.
___30.Family members share interests and hobbies with each other.

SCHOOL FACES-II

1	2	3	4	5
Almost Never	**Once in Awhile**	**Sometimes**	**Frequently**	**Almost Always**

Describe your school:

___1. School members and parents of the school are supportive of each other during difficult times.
___2. At the school, it is easy for everyone to express his/her opinion.
___3. It is easier to discuss school-related problems with people associated with the school (i.e., teachers or parents of students) than with people not associated with your school.
___4. Each parent, teacher, or principal has input regarding major school decisions.
___5. School members and parents spend time together socializing at the school.
___6. Children have a say in their discipline at their school.
___7. The school has many functions that families participate in highly.
___8. School members and parents discuss problems together and feel good about solutions.
___9. At the school, everyone goes his/her own way.
___10. School-related responsibilities shift from person to person.
___11. School members and parents know each other's close friends.
___12. It is hard to know what the rules are in the school.
___13. School members and parents consult with each other on decisions related to the students.
___14. School members and parents know what they want from their school.
___15. School members and parents have difficulty thinking of things to do as a school.
___16. In solving problems, the students' suggestions are followed.
___17. School members and parents feel very close to each other.
___18. Discipline is fair in our school.
___19. School members and parents feel closer to people outside the school than to other school members.
___20. Our school tries new ways of dealing with problems.
___21. School members and parents go along with what the members decide to do.
___22. At our school, everyone shares responsibilities.
___23. School members and parents like to spend their time with each other.
___24. It is difficult to get a rule changed at our school.
___25. School members and parents avoid each other at school.

___26. When problems arise, we compromise.
___27. School members and parents approve of each other's friends.
___28. School members and parents are afraid to say what is on their minds.
___29. School members and parents pair up rather than do things as a total school.
___30. School members and parents share interests and hobbies with each other.

ACCULTURATION SCALE

Instructions: In the following questions, please mark a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 next to each question as to how it applies to you.

Key for questions 1 to 8.

1	2	3	4	5
Your Native Language all the time	**Your Native Language most of the time**	**Your Native Language & English equally**	**English most of the time**	**English all the time**

_____1. What language do you prefer to speak?
_____2. What language do you speak at home?
_____3. What language do you speak at school?
_____4. What language do you speak at work?
_____5. What language do you speak with friends?
_____6. In what language are the T.V. programs you watch?
_____7. In what language are the radio stations you listen to?
_____8. In what language are the books and magazines you read?

Key for questions 9 to 15.

1	2	3	4	5
Your Native Country's all the time	**Your Native Country's most of the time**	**Your Native Country's at times & American other times**	**American most of the time**	**American all the time**

_____9. What sort of music do you listen to?
_____10. What sort of dances do you dance?
_____11. What sort of places do you go out to?
_____12. What sort of recreation do you engage in?
_____13. My ways of celebrating birthdays is?
_____14. My way of relating to my fiancee is?
_____15. The gestures I use in talking are?

Instructions: Sometimes life is not as we really want it. If you could have your way, how would you like the following aspects of your life to be?

Key for questions 16 to 24.

1	2	3	4	5
I would wish this to be completely like my Native Country's	**I would wish this to be mostly like my Native Country's**	**I would wish this to be like my Native Country's**	**I would wish this to be mostly American**	**I would wish this to be completely American**

_____16. Food
_____17. Language
_____18. Music
_____19. T.V. Show
_____20. Books/Magazines
_____21. Dances
_____22. Radio Programs
_____23. Way of Celebrating Birthdays
_____24. Way of Celebrating Weddings

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please indicate the following in reference to yourself and your opinions.

1. Gender:
   ____1.Male
   ____2.Female

2. Relationship to child:
   ____1.Father
   ____2.Mother
   ____3.Other_____

3. Race/Ethnicity:
   ____1.African American
   ____2.American Indian
   ____3.Asian/Pacific Islander
   ____4.Caucasian
   ____5.Latino
   ____6.Other_____

4. Highest Level of Education Attained:
   ____1.Less than High School Diploma
   ____2.High School Graduate
   ____3.College Graduate
   ____4.Master's or Professional Degree

5. Please indicate if you were born in the United States or in another country?
   ____1.Born in the United States
   ____2.Born in another country

6. If you were not born in the United States, please indicate which country you are from:_____.

7. If you were not born in the United States, please check how long you have lived in the United States:

____0-2 years____3-5 years ____5-10 years____10 plus years

SCHOOL SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

1	2	3	4	5
Almost Never Satisfied	**Once in Awhile Satisfied**	**Sometimes Satisfied**	**Frequently Satisfied**	**Almost Always Satisfied**

For the following questions, please mark a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 next to each question as to how you feel about each situation.

____1. How satisfied are you with how the school disciplines your child?

What suggestions do you have, if any?

____If you came from another country, how satisfied are you with how the United States' schools discipline your child (as compared to how your home country's schools discipline your child)?

What comments do you have, if any?

____2. How satisfied are you with the subjects (i.e., Reading, Spelling, etc.) that your child is taught?

What suggestions do you have, if any?

____If you came from another country, how satisfied are you with the subjects taught in the United States' schools (as compared to the subjects taught in your home country's schools)?

What comments do you have, if any?

____3. How satisfied are you with how different cultures are taught in the school?

What suggestions do you have, if any?

____4. How satisfied are you with the extra-curricular activities (i.e, sports, drama, clubs) offered in the school?

____If you came from another country, how satisfied are you with the extra-curricular activities offered in the United States (as compared to your home country)?

What comments do you have, if any?

____5. How satisfied are you with the teachers and principals at your school?

____If you came from another country, how satisfied are you with the teachers and principals here (as compared to your home country)?

What comments do you have, if any?

APPENDIX B

PERMISSION LETTERS

UNIVERSITY OF Miami
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
Department of Psychiatry
and Behavioral Sciences

May 9, 1996

Julie Lackaff
1033 W. Loyola Avenue
#1006
Chicago, IL 60626

Dear Ms. Lackaff:

I have read your dissertation outline and the adaptations you made on my Acculturation Scale. I am granting you permission to use this adapted version for your dissertation. I would appreciate a copy of your study when it is completed.

Wishing you success I remain,

Sincerely yours,

José Szapocznik, Ph.D.
Professor and Director

JS/mp

Center for Family Studies
1425 N.W. 10th Avenue, 3rd Floor
Miami, Florida 33136
Phone: (305) 243-4592
Fax: (305) 243-5577
E-Mail: VMALDONA @ MEDNET. MED. MIAMI. EDU

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Family Social Science
College of Human Ecology

290 McNeal Hall
1985 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
612-625-7250
Fax: 612-625-4227

April 30, 1996

Julie Lackaff
1033 W. Loyola Ave.
#1006
Chicago, IL 60626

Dear Ms. Lackaff,

I am writing to confirm that you have my permission to use the school version of FACES II that you developed for your dissertation. I understand that University Microfilms may release single copies of your dissertation upon demand.

Please send us a copy of your dissertation when it is completed if you can, or if this would not be feasible, the Abstract, Methods, and Results sections.

Sincerely,

David H. Olson, Ph.D.
Professor

REFERENCES

Apter, S.J. (1982). Troubled Children: Troubled Systems. New York: Pergamon Press.

Argulewicz, E.N., & Sanchez, D.T. (1982). Considerations in the assessment of reading difficulties in bilingual children. School Psychology Review, 11, 281-289.

Atkinson, D.R., Morten, G., & Sue, D.W. (Eds.) (1989). Counseling American Minorities: Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.

Bowen, M. (1978). Family Therapy in Clinical Practice. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Buenning, M., Tollefson, N., & Rodriguez, F. (1992). Hispanic culture and the schools. In M.J. Fine & C. Carlson (Eds.), The Handbook of Family-School Intervention: A Systems Perspective. (pp. 86-101). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Carlson, C. (1992). Models and strategies of family-school assessment and intervention. In M.J. Fine and C. Carlson (Eds.), The Handbook of Family-School Intervention: A Systems Perspective. (pp. 18-44). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Christenson, S.L., Rounds, T., & Franklin, M.J. (1992). Home-school collaboration: Efforts, issues, and opportunities. In S.L. Christenson and J.C. Conoley (Eds.), Home-School Collaboration: Enhancing Children's Academic and Social Competence. (pp. 19-51). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Conoley, J.C. (1987). Schools and families: Theoretical and practical bridges. Professional School Psychology, 2, 191-203.

Deal, T. (1990). Private schools: Bridging Mr. Chips and my captain. Teachers College Record, 92(3), 415-424.

Epstein, J.L. & Dauber, S.L. (1991). School programs and teacher practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. Special issue: Educational partnerships: Home-school community. Elementary School Journal, 91, 289-305.

Fine, M.J. & Carlson, C. (1992). The Handbook of Family-School Intervention: A Systems Perspective. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Flanagan, D.P. & Miranda, A.H. (1995). Best practices in working with culturally different families. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.). Best Practices in School Psychology-III. Washington, DC: The National Association of School Psychologists.

Florian, V., Mikulincer, M., & Weller, A. (1993). Does culture affect perceived family dynamics? A comparison of Arab and Jewish adolescents in Israel. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 24(2), 189-201.

Gary, L., Beatty, L.A., Berry, G.L., & Price, M.D. (1983). Stable black families: Final report. In Mental Health Research and Development, edited by Institute for Urban Affairs and Research. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Haley, J. (1959). The family of the schizophrenic: A model system. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders, 129, 357-374.

Haley, J. (1962). Family experiments: A new type of experimentation. Family Process, 1, 265-293.

Haley, J. (1963). Strategies of Psychotherapy. New York, NY: Grune & Stratton.

Haley, J. (1987). Problem Solving Therapy. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Henderson, A. (1989). The Evidence Continues to Grow: Parent Involvement Improves Student Achievement. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hill, R.B. (1972). Strength of Black Families. New York, NY: Emerson-Hall.

Ho, M. (1976). Social work with Asian Americans. Social Casework, 57, 195-201.

Ho, M.K. (1992). Asian-American Students: Family Influences. In M.J. Fine & C. Carlson (Eds.), The Handbook

of Family-School Intervention: A Systems Perspective. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hoffman, L. (1981). Foundations of Family Therapy: A Conceptual Framework. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Hughes, M., Wikely, F., & Nash, T. (1994). Parents and their Children's Schools. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Lusterman, D.D. (1985). An ecosystemic approach to family-school problems. American Journal of Family Therapy, 13, 22-30.

Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and Family Therapy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Olson, D.H. (1977). Insiders' and outsiders' views of relationships: Research studies. In G. Levinger & H. Rausch (Eds.), Close Relationships: Perspectives on the Meaning of Intimacy. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.

Olson, D.H., McCubbin, H.I., Barnes, H.L., Muxen, M.J., Larsen, A.S., & Wilson, M.A. (1989). Families: What Makes Them Work. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Quinnan, E. J., Lackaff, J.A., Massoth, P.R., & Mechanick, J.C. (1994, October). The Impact of School Culture on Family Dynamics. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT), Chicago, IL.

Ramirez, M. III., & Castanada, A. (1974). Cultural demoncracy, bicognitive development, and education. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Rich, D. (1987). Schools and Families: Issues and Actions. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Royce, D., & Turner, G. (1980). Strengths of black families: A black community prespective. Social Work, 25, 407-409.

Sloan, K.D. (1991). Home support for successful learning. In S.B. Silvern (Ed.), Advances in Reading/Language Research: Vol. 5. Literacy Through Family, Community, and School Interaction. (pp. 153-172). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Speer, D. (1970). Family systems: Morphostasis and morphogenesis, or is homestasis enough? Family Process, 9, 259-278.

Steward, R.J., & Logan, S.L. (1992). Understanding the black family and child in the school context. In M.J. Fine & C. Carlson (Eds.), The Handbook of Family-School Intervention: A Systems Perspective. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M.A., & Kurtines, W. (1978). Theory and measurement of acculturation. Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 12, 113-130.

Triandis, H.C. (1990). Theoretical concepts that are applicable to the analysis of ethnocentricism. In R.W. Brislin (Ed.) (pp. 34-55). Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology. New York, NY: Sage Publications.

Vega, W.A., Patterson, T., Sallis, J., Nader, P., Atkins, C., & Abramson, I. (1986). Cohesion and adaptibility in Mexican-American and Anglo Families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 857-867.

Wertheim, E. (1973). Family unit therapy and the science and typology of family systems. Family Process, 12, 361-376.

Wertheim, E. (1975). The science and typology of family systems II: Further theoretical and practical considerations, Family Process, 14, 285-308.

VITA

The author, Julie Lackaff, is the daughter of Jacqueline (Ahlgrim) Lackaff and Michael Lackaff. She obtained her elementary education at Saint Joseph's School in Downers Grove, Illinois and her high school education at Benet Academy in Lisle, Illinois.

She received her Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, Illinois in May 1990. In August 1993, she completed the requirements for a Master of Science degree in Clinical Psychology from Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

She currently is a school psychologist for the Whittier City School District in Whittier, California.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Julie A. Lackaff has been read and approved by the following committee:

Edward Quinnan, S.J., Ph.D., Director
Assistant Professor of Counseling Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Ronald Morgan, Ph.D.
Professor of School Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Carol Harding, Ph.D.
Professor of Counseling Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

3 April 1997
Date

Director's Signature